

A SOCIO-POLITICAL ANALYSIS  
OF THE VARIOUS JEWISH SECTS  
PREVALENT DURING THE SECOND COMMONWEALTH

HENRY JAY KARP

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the  
Master of Arts in Hebrew Literature Degree and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion  
New York, N.Y.

Date April 4, 1975

Advisor: Professor Martin A. Cohen

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to all those people who made this work possible. I thank the following.

Dr. Martin A. Cohen, my teacher. Without his help, advice, guidance, and encouragement, this thesis would never have been written. Any skill which I may possess as an historian is due to him.

The staff of the library of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, New York School. Their assistance was invaluable in the researching of this work.

My parents, Samuel and Helene Karp. Not only did they give me love, sustenance and encouragements, but their proofreading, comments and criticisms contributed greatly to the quality of this work.

Mr. Joseph R. Chiappone, my closest friend. In the spirit of friendship, he lifted from my shoulders the burden of the responsibility of all duplication involved in this work.

Rabbi Jack Stern, Jr., Rabbi Stuart A. Gertman, and Cantor Joseph Boardman, of Westchester Reform Temple, my colleagues and my friends. Out of their understanding and their friendship, they relieved me from as many of my professional obligations as possible so that I might complete this work.

Last, but definitely not least, Gail Ilene Posner, by bride-to-be. "A woman of valour who can find? Her price is far above rubies." In her love I found strength. In her relentless encouragement I found the will to continue when I had all but given up.

Although her studies in the School of Sacred Music of the Hebrew

Union College take up a great deal of her time and energy, she made the time to take on the onerous task of typing this work. She has been, and will continue to be, my inspiration. It is to her that I dedicate this work.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ix
I. Sects During the Hasmonean Period	1
II. Sects during the Roman Period from the Roman Takeover in 57 B.C.E. until the Death of Herod in 4 B.C.E.	10
III. Sects during the Reign of Archelaus	22
IV. Judah of Galilee, Zadok the Pharisee, the Founding of the Fourth-Philosophy-Zealot Party, and the Revolt in Galilee in 6 C.E.	26
V. The Apocalyptic	30
VI. The Messianists and the Pseudo-Messiahs	33
VII. The Militant Sects During the Period Prior to the Revolution of 66 C.E.	40
VIII. The Disturbances in Jerusalem during the Procurator- ship of Florus (64 C.E.-66 C.E.) as the final preparatory stage for a Shammaite-Inspired and Led Revolution	44
IX. The Successful Initiation of the Revolution of 66 C.E.-73 C.E. as the Result of the Formation of a Shammaite-Led Confederation of Dissident Sects	49
X. The Qumran sect as Essenes and their Incorporation into the Confederation	53
XI. The Role of the Sects in the Battle for Jerusalem	72



XII.	The Extension of the War Throughout Judea and the Defeat of Cestius Gallus' Army as the Ultimate Military Objective of the Shammaite-Sadducee Strategy	79
XIII.	The Shammaite and Sadducean Preparations for the Final Stage of Their Limited Revolution	83
XIV.	The Failure of the Shammaite-Sadducean Plan for a Limited Revolution	86
XV.	Factionalism Among the Zealots as a Major Contributing Factor to Their Defeat and the Destruction of Jerusalem	92
	Bibliography	96

## INTRODUCTION

The Second Commonwealth existed for a period of a mere 212 years, from the beginning of the reign of Simon the Hasmonean, in 142 B.C.E. until the destruction of Jerusalem, in 70 C.E. Though it was of short duration, its history was far from uneventful. As it was born out of a revolution, so it died in a revolution. During this period, the Judean state rose to the heights and fell to the depths. It was a time of social, economic, and political chaos. Out of this chaos a proud, independent Jewish state was turned into a vassal of Rome, and a vassal of Rome was turned into rubble and ruins. It was a time of massive discontent and almost continual rebellion. Out of this atmosphere of discontent were created those mysterious documents known as the Dead Sea Scrolls. Out of this world in upheaval was born a force that would affect the entire history of mankind--Christianity.

All too often historians mistakenly present this period as a conglomeration of confused facts and figures, defying explanation. As chaotic as this period was it was not as confused as historians claim it to be. In order to understand exactly what happened during these 212 years, an examination of the various Jewish sects prevalent at the time is necessary. As much as these sects were a product of their times, they created their times. These sects were the forces which guided the history of the Second Commonwealth. Out of an understanding of what they were, what they believed in, what they did, and why they did it, a definite pattern emerges, shedding light on a period, which for all too long has been kept in darkness.

In compiling this work, I have had to depend on many sources. The primary sources, however, have been limited. My major primary source has been Josephus. Though there are points in which Josephus' accuracy is questionable, he presents the most detailed and accurate account of the times. I have, with reservation, used the New Testament. It must be remembered that the New Testament is a theological, not an historical document. Other primary sources I have used include the Babylonian Talmud, the Midrash, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

There does exist on this period a plethora of secondary sources. I have used a healthy sampling of both the good and the bad. Among the secondary sources which I have used are found some of the works of three of the finest scholars who deal with this period, they being, Solomon Zeitlin, Cecil Roth, and S. G. F. Brandon.

## CHAPTER I

### Sects during the Hasmonean Period

In a study of the various Jewish sects during the period of the Second Commonwealth, one must turn to the reign of Simon, the first of the Hasmonean rulers. Simon ruled the independent Judean state between 142 B.C.E. and 135 B.C.E. While it is true that there is no information on the sects during Simon's seven year reign, much can be deduced.

By looking ahead to the reign on John Hyrcanus, Simon's successor, it can be seen that the sects known as the Pharisees and the Sadducees were already well established. Therefore, it can be deduced that these sects must have emerged during Simon's reign.

In order to gain some insight into the nature of the Pharisees and the Sadducees during the reign of Simon, one must analyze their titles. The Hebrew equivalent for the name "Pharisee" is Perushim. This title would seem to indicate that they were, in some way, separatists. Since all the information regarding the Pharisees indicates that they were a politically oriented sect, it can be safely assumed that they were a politically oriented group, during the reign of Simon, which separated itself, breaking away from the major political power group of that time. The Sadducees were also a politically oriented sect. They derived their name from the priestly family of Zadok. In their case, it can be safely assumed that they were a political party, basically representing the priestly element of the society.

During the reign of John Hyrcanus, a period which spanned the years of 135 B.C.E. to 104 B.C.E. these two sects came into full view. The basic Jewish source of this period, the works of Josephus, gives us a clear picture of these two sects during this time.

According to Josephus, the Sadducees represented a wealthy minority.<sup>1</sup> They were not determinists, for they believed in the total free will of man.<sup>2</sup> They also believed that the soul is not immortal, and that it receives no divine reward or retribution.<sup>3</sup> They held others in disrespect.<sup>4</sup> They only accepted the Written Law.

The Pharisees, on the other hand, were semi-determinists, believing in a combination of the free will of man and the involvement of God in man's affairs.<sup>6</sup> They believed that the soul is immortal, and that it receives the divine reward and retribution.<sup>7</sup> Unlike the Sadducees, the Pharisees lived meanly, despising delicacies.<sup>8</sup> They held the aged in great regard.<sup>9</sup> They were responsive to the needs of the people.<sup>10</sup> They held the principle of legitimacy paramount, opposed to having any tainted individual holding the sacred office of high priest. In regard to law, they went beyond the Sadducees by accepting the Oral, as well as the Written Law.<sup>11</sup>

During the reign of John Hyrcanus a major political power struggle involving these two groups occurred. This power struggle centered around John Hyrcanus' acquisition of the high priesthood. It is through Josephus' version of the events,<sup>12</sup> distorted as it might be, that the factual tools for reconstructing this conflict are made available.<sup>13</sup>

According to Josephus, John Hyrcanus, originally a Pharisee himself, asked the advice of his fellow Pharisees on how he could become

more virtuous. Eleazar, a seditious Pharisee, reproached him questioning his legitimacy as high priest. Eleazar told him to lay down the high priesthood, and to be happy leading only the civil government. After this confrontation, Jonathan, a Sadducee, advised John Hyrcanus that Eleazar spoke for all Pharisees. Jonathan, knowing that the Pharisees did not believe in the death sentence, suggested to John Hyrcanus that he have them recommend a suitable punishment for Eleazar. Thusly, their loyalty would be judged by the stringency of their recommended punishment. When the Pharisees recommended stripes and bonds, John Hyrcanus misunderstood this to mean that they all supported Eleazar's stand. John Hyrcanus immediately went over to the Sadducees, abolishing all Pharisaic decrees. However, the people sided with the Pharisees, against John Hyrcanus and the Sadducees.

The Josephus account of this event cannot be totally accepted as pure history for many reasons. It is probable that Josephus, being a Pharisee, wished to portray his sect in a favorable light. Besides the question of the author's objectivity, there also exist many inconsistencies and gaps in this version. If John Hyrcanus was truly a Pharisee, why would any member of that party be opposed to his taking the high priesthood? By taking it, he would be putting that position into Pharisaic hands. Why was John Hyrcanus' legitimacy not questioned before he took the high priesthood? If John Hyrcanus was a Pharisee, then why was he not aware that the Pharisees did not believe in capital punishment? All these questions cannot help but create an aura of doubt around the Josephus version.

Taking the most basic points in the Josephus version, this conflict can be historically reconstructed. This reconstruction reveals not a private argument between John Hyrcanus and the Pharisees, but rather a real political struggle between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

It is obvious that a delicate balance of power existed between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. It was probably within John Hyrcanus' power to tip that balance in favor of whatever group he supported. Therefore, John Hyrcanus' original association with the Pharisees would seem to indicate that prior to the establishment of this balance, the Pharisees were the superior power group. Once the balance was established, the Sadducees moved to tip it in their favor by winning John Hyrcanus to their side. They offered him the high priesthood, that being the religious authority position. They probably also offered him increased secular authority, once the balance was upset in their favor. John Hyrcanus' eventual defection to the Sadducees created a major power shift in the government. As a result of this shift, the power of the Pharisees was severely limited, while the Sadducees gained control in both the religious and secular realms.

Under this framework, the reaction on the part of the Pharisees can be clearly understood. They withdrew from the government so as to put themselves in a position to criticize it freely. They then proceeded to set up a classical revolutionary situation. By doing this, they put themselves in a bargaining position with the Sadducees. To set up this revolutionary situation, they had to take various actions, in order to gain popular support. One such action was to gain the support of the people through the use of ideology. One way they did



this was to throw John Hyrcanus' high priesthood into question. Another way was by supporting ideologies which met the theological needs of the people. Therefore, it is no surprise to find the Pharisees favoring such concepts as God's concern for human actions, the immortality of the soul, and divine reward and punishment. Another of their aims was to gain support through their own life style. By living as they did, they not only set themselves up in contrast to the Sadducees, but also created an image of themselves as the true representatives of the people. They also gained support by meeting their people's real social needs through a liberal approach to the law. The success of these methods is evidenced by history. The Pharisees not only gained the support of the people,<sup>14</sup> but also forced the Sadducees to accede to their demands.<sup>15</sup>

The Pharisees did not retain their position of power for long. It appears that during a major part of the reign of Alexander Jannai (103 B.C.E. to 76 B.C.E.) the Sadducees were the superior power group. The Pharisees, with considerable popular support, were far from suppressed.

Alexander Jannai and the Sadducean government, constantly engaged in warfare, could not afford internal strife. The Pharisees used this to their advantage. In order to create a power shift in their favor, the Pharisees began a revolt which lasted from 94 B.C.E. until 88 B.C.E. This forced the Sadducees to relinquish authority, as evidenced by Alexander Jannai's settlement with the Pharisees.

As a result of their revolution under Alexander Jannai, the Pharisees retained power for some time. Their power reached its peak during the reign of Queen Salome Alexandra, 76 B.C.E. to 67 B.C.E.



During this period, the Pharisees were in total control of the government.<sup>16</sup>

After the reign of Queen Salome Alexandra, the Pharisee-Sadducee power struggle re-emerged in the form of a civil war between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, the two pretenders to the throne of Judea.

Hyrcanus was supported by the Pharisees, Aristobulus by the Sadducees.<sup>17</sup>

In the first phase of this war, the Sadducees gained control of the government, as evidenced by Hyrcanus' surrender of both the throne and the high priesthood. This indicates that during the reign of Salome Alexandra, the Pharisees lost a good deal of their popular support. This seems to be an indication that the Sadducees must have been able to adjust some of their ideological position to attract some of the support the Pharisees had lost.

Even after the initial Sadducean victory, the conflict remained undecided, as evidenced by Hyrcanus' victorious return. Hyrcanus' victory was an obvious power shift favoring the Pharisees. This was not a total Pharisaic victory. There were a number of Sadducees found among Hyrcanus' supporters. This would seem to indicate that there must have been internal conflict within the Sadducean party, with the losers supporting Hyrcanus in his comeback. These dissident Sadducees probably made a pact with the Pharisees in order to oust their opponents in their part. The union of the Pharisees and the dissenting Sadducees was not strong enough to oust the controlling Sadducean element. In order to accomplish this goal, they had to solicit support from the Nabateans.

This civil war became a vehicle whereby the Romans gained a foothold in Judea. Even with the Nabatean involvement, the outcome was still in doubt. Both sides appealed to the Roman general Pompey, to intercede in their. In 65 B.C.E. Pompey interceded in favor of Aristobulus and the Sadducees, by depriving Hyrcanus of his Nabatean support.

Pompey's intercession did not end this power struggle. His ousting of Aristobulus, in 63 B.C.E., suggests another power shift, this time favoring the Pharisees. While the Pharisees gained control of the government, their position was still not secure, as can be seen by the fact that Pompey denied Hyrcanus the title of king. Therefore, by the end of the Hasmonean period, even though the Pharisees had gained control of the government, the Sadducees still constituted a very significant power element.

## Footnotes to Chapter I

1. Flavius Josephus, The Antiquities of the Jews, XIII:XI:6; XVIII:I:4.
2. Josephus, Antiquities, XIII:V:9; The Wars of the Jews, II:VIII:14.
3. Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII:I:4; Wars, Ibid.
4. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.
5. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.; XIII:XI:6.
6. Josephus, Antiquities, XIII:VI:9; XVIII:I:3; Wars, Ibid.
7. Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII:I:3; Wars, Ibid.
8. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.
11. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.; XIII:XI:6.
12. Josephus, Antiquities, XIII:XI:5-6.
13. There is another account of these events found in Tractate Kiddushin: 66a, of the Babylonian Talmud. While these two versions differ, their differences have little or no effect on the presentation found here. Therefore, the Kiddushin account has been omitted. However, the Kiddushin account does indicate that the charge of illegitimacy, leveled against John Hyrcanus, was investigated and found to be false. Such a statement might be a reflection of the later compromise reached between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.
14. Josephus, The Life of Flavius Josephus, 3; Antiquities, XVII:II:4; XVII:II:3.
15. Josephus, Antiquities, XIII:XI:5;6; XVII:II:4.

16. Josephus, Wars, I:V:2.

17. Josephus, Antiquities, XIII:XVI:2.

## CHAPTER II

## Sects during the Roman Period

From the Roman takeover in 57 B.C.E.

Until the death of Herod in 4 B.C.E.

The beginning of the Roman period was marked by a series of unsuccessful, Sadducean led, revolts. These revolts were attempts to wrest control of the government from the Pharisees. The first revolt occurred in 56 B.C.E. The revolutionary forces were headed by Aristobulus, a known Sadducee, and one of his sons, Antigonus. Another revolt occurred in 55 B.C.E. This one, led by Alexander, another of Aristobulus' sons, was probably a continuation of the first. Many factors contribute to this assumption. This revolt occurred only one year later than the first. As in the first revolt, the leadership came from the house of Aristobulus. The similar leadership would seem to indicate, not only a similar power backing, but also a similar constituency from the masses. It is to be noted that at the time of this revolt, Gabinius, the Roman governor of the area, was busy in Egypt. Because of Gabinius' absence, the leadership of the first revolt was probably able to retain its support among the masses by offering a new hope of success.

The third, and final, revolt of this period occurred in 54 B.C.E.<sup>18</sup> This revolt was led by a man named Pitholaus. Josephus' description of Pitholaus as the successor to Aristobulus would seem to indicate that this was another Sadducean revolt. This revolt was violently suppressed by Crassus, the Roman general. Upon the advice

of Antipater the Idumean, the man who appears to have held the real executive power in Hyrcanus' government, Crassus ordered Pitholaus' execution. The suppression of this revolt was a major Sadducean defeat. The violence exercised by the Romans leaves no question as to their support of the Pharisees over the Sadducees. The fact that this was the last revolt of the early Roman period would seem to indicate that, at least for the time being, Sadducean resistance to the Pharisaic government was successfully dissipated.

The split in the Roman world, between Julius Caesar and Pompey, during the period between 49 B.C.E. and 48 B.C.E., affected the political situation in Judea. Aristobulus and the Sadducees immediately proclaimed their support of Julius Caesar. It was unfortunate for the Sadducees that before Aristobulus had an opportunity to mobilize his forces, he was assassinated by Pompey's party.<sup>19</sup> This alliance with Caesar was an obvious attempt on the part of the Sadducees to be reinstated as the controlling power group in Judea. They probably saw Caesar's victory as a foregone conclusion. They also must have realized that, with Pompey controlling Egypt, it was impossible for the Pharisees to make such an alliance and survive. After Caesar's victory, they expected to be rewarded for their loyalty.

Faced with an impossible political situation, Hyrcanus, Antipater, and the Pharisees chose neutrality as their safest alternative. After Pompey's death, when the issue was all but decided, they declared their support for Caesar. They sent troops to Egypt, to aid Caesar in suppressing the remainder of Pompey's forces.<sup>20</sup> The

Pharisees had gambled that Caesar, given the slightest excuse, would support them over the Sadducees because their government was already established. Their gambit proved successful. Caesar confirmed Hyrcanus in the high priesthood and also appointed him ethnarch, while, at the same time, he made Antipater a citizen of Rome.<sup>21</sup>

It is evident that throughout this period that Antipater's authority increased at the expense of Hyrcanus' authority. Antipater's appointments of his son, Herod, as prefect of the Galilee, and of his son, Phezahel, as prefect of Jerusalem is a manifestation of this shift in authority.<sup>22</sup> This shift would seem to indicate that Antipater was actually a representative of the major Pharisaic power group.<sup>23</sup> An internal struggle in the Pharisaic party could serve as a possible explanation for this shift in authority. If there was such a conflict, Hyrcanus must have aligned himself with the dissident group. This dissident group must not have been successful. Because of their defeat, Hyrcanus lost most of his authority, but was allowed to retain his title for the sake of legitimacy. Another reason why Hyrcanus retained his title of ethnarch is that his party probably was not totally suppressed, but remained a powerful element among the Pharisees.

The internal struggle within the Pharisaic party, being far from resolved, manifested itself again, in the form of Hezekiah's revolt in the Galilee, in 37 B.C.E.<sup>24</sup> Hezekiah's forces were defeated by Herod. Because of the violence employed in the suppression of this revolt, Herod was brought to trial before the Sanhedrin.<sup>25</sup>



He was ultimately acquitted.<sup>26</sup> Hezekiah was probably backed by the dissident Pharisaic group. If Hezekiah did not receive such support, there would be no explanation for Herod being brought to trial. Herod's acquittal would seem to indicate that the Pharisaic group which he represented successfully defeated their opposition and retained their power position.

Hezekiah was the forerunner of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, a later group which was also a product of this internal conflict.<sup>27</sup> The Fourth Philosophy-Zealot party was founded by Hezekiah's son, Judah of Galilee. Like Hezekiah, they fought for political independence from Rome. Josephus refers to Hezekiah as a "robber." He later uses this same term in referring to the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.

The internal conflict in the Pharisaic party could not help but to weaken it substantially, affording the Sadducees an opportunity to make a power play. The Sadducees used the Parthian invasion of 40 B.C.E. as a vehicle for such a power shift. Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus and a known Saduccee, was among the parthians who besieged Jerusalem. With him was a sizeable Jewish contingent.<sup>28</sup> The Parthians took Hyrcanus and Phezahel captive.<sup>29</sup> Herod evaded capture.<sup>30</sup> With the capture of Jerusalem, and the ascension of Antigonus to the throne of Judea, the Sadducee takeover was complete.<sup>31</sup>

After the defeat of the Parthians, the Romans were faced with a political dilemma in Judea. The Sadducees were far more popular among the people than the Pharisees. Therefore, it was to the benefit



of Rome that the Sadducees remain in power. Yet the Sadducees had supported the Parthians while the Pharisees had supported the Romans. If the Romans officially gave control of Judea to the Sadducees, and not the Pharisees, they would have set a disastrous precedent by rewarding their enemies and punishing their friends.

In dealing with this dilemma, the Romans followed a policy of minimal involvement. The Romans did not immediately oust Antigonus in hopes of attaining a liason with the Sadducees. In order to fulfill their obligations to the Pharisees, the Romans appointed Herod as king. This appointment was only a facade of support for the Pharisees. After Herod's appointment, the Romans were reluctant to give Herod military support in his attempt to claim the throne. The Roman policy was one of sanctioning a war between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.<sup>32</sup> Once the issue was resolved, the Romans aligned themselves with the victorious Pharisees.

During the Pharisee-Sadducee conflict, the internal struggle within the Pharisaic party was set aside. Once the Pharisees re-established their control of Judea, this struggle re-emerged. As before, the Hasmonean element of the Pharisees were among the dissident group. One of the major public issues of this conflict was probably the question of Herod's legitimacy. It was in light of this issue that Herod married Miriam, the Hasmonean princess. Through this marriage, Herod, and the group which he represented, must have been able to make a reconciliation with some of the more moderate members of their opposition. This marriage also served to undermine the opposition's use of the concept of legitimacy as

a tool to arouse the people. While Herod was not a Hasmonean, he would be able to offer to the people a Hasmonean heir to the throne.

Despite Herod's marriage to Miriam, the Hasmoneans remained in opposition to him and his group. Neither did this marriage have the desired effect of significantly weakening the dissident Pharisaic group. Marc Antony's imposition upon Herod of the appointment of Aristobulus, Miriam's brother, to the position of high priest, in 35 B.C.E.,<sup>33</sup> is an indicator of how strong this group was. This group was quite capable of creating a popular, Hasmonean led, revolution, as is evidenced by the warm reception the people gave to Aristobulus' appointment.<sup>34</sup> As high priest, Aristobulus offered this group a leadership figure around whom they could mobilize such a revolution. Realizing this, Herod had no other alternative but to have Aristobulus assassinated.<sup>35</sup> This assassination was the first of a series, for as long as there was a Hasmonean left alive, Herod's throne was threatened. Using the excuse of infidelity, Herod had Miriam, the most popular of the Hasmoneans, executed in 29 B.C.E.<sup>36</sup> In 28 B.C.E., Herod had Alexandra, his mother-in-law, executed for the crime of treason.<sup>37</sup> In 25 B.C.E., Herod had the remainder of the Hasmoneans executed.<sup>38</sup>

During the reign of Herod, the Pharisaic Sanhedrin was responsible for the laws regulating the everyday life of the country. It was in the Sanhedrin that the split among the Pharisees manifested itself and finally crystallized in the formation of two parties, the Hillelites and the Shammaites. In terms of law, the Hillelites were

loose constructionists. Since most of the laws followed their interpretation, it is obvious that they were the major power element.<sup>39</sup> The Shammaites, on the other hand, were strict constructionists of the law. The Shammaites must have been the major opposition party.

In the latter part of Herod's reign, the Shammaites, or at least a group within the Shammaitic party, in their opposition to Herod and the Hillelites, resorted to violence on several occasions. One such incident involved an attempt on Herod's life.<sup>40</sup> The people were provoked against Herod due to his introduction of foreign practices.<sup>41</sup> In the midst of the popular uproar, ten men plotted the assassination of Herod. Their plan was to enter the theatre, where he would be, with daggers under their cloaks, and there kill him. Through his system of spies, Herod discovered the plot. He had the conspirators executed. It is possible that these assassins were forerunners of, if not actually early Sicarii, a sect of Shammaitic origins.<sup>42</sup> Like the Sicarii, they were assassins, their victim was a major Jewish political figure whom they accused of violating Jewish law, they used daggers, which they concealed in their clothing, and they planned to kill their victim in public. The public uproar and the assassination plot were probably Shammaite inspired. Such opposition to foreign practices would have been in concord with the strict constructionism of the Shammaites. Herod's sudden death would give the Shammaites an opportunity to depose the Hillelite power group.

Another such incident involved a Pharisaic revolt against Herod.<sup>43</sup> This rebellion was set off because of the imposition of a loyalty oath to Rome.<sup>44</sup> This must have been a Shammaite rebellion.<sup>45</sup> The Shammaites were the only Pharisaic group of the time that were powerful enough to organize such a rebellion. It is very likely that the Shammaites were able to use the imposition of such an oath as an issue around which they could rally the support of the people.

In 4 B.C.E.,<sup>46</sup> while Herod was on his deathbed, another violent incident occurred.<sup>47</sup> Judah benSapphoris and Matthias ben Margalus, two men of learning, teachers of the Pharisaic sect, led a group of their students in tearing down the golden Roman eagle which Herod had erected over the gate of the Temple. Herod had the leaders executed. That Judah and Matthias were high ranking Pharisees is clearly understood from Josephus' description of them as men of learning. They could not have been Hillelites because Herod's backers, being Hillelites, must have given their approval to the erection of the golden eagle. This action was the equivalent of a declaration of rebellion against Rome. The Hillelites, being in power, would not have tried to break with Rome. Therefore, Judah, Matthias, and their group must have been Shammaites. The Shammaites were the only other Pharisaic group which was strong enough to make such a bold move. The Shammaites were in a position of rally the support of the people around such an issue. Opposition to the erection of the eagle was in consonance with the Shammaites' strict approach to the law, through which it could be considered a form of idolatry. For a Shammaite uprising, aimed at ousting the Hillelites,

the timing was right. They probably felt that Herod, on his deathbed, would be ineffective as an opponent. Herod's successor, not yet having taken, to say nothing of having established, the reins of government in his hands, would be powerless in opposing them. Herod's reign ended in the midst of an inter-Pharisaic conflict which would plague the Judean state until its eventual downfall.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER II

18. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:VII:3.
19. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:VII:4.
20. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:VIII:1.
21. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:VIII:3.
22. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:VIII:2.
23. M. Aberbach, in "The Historical Allusions of Chapters IV, XI, and XIII of the Psalms of Solomon", Jewish Quarterly Review, XLI, (April, 1951), pp. 379-396, states the contrary view that Antipater was opposed by the majority of the Pharisees.
24. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.
25. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:IX:4.
26. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:IX:5.
27. For details concerning the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, see below, pp. 26-28.
28. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:XIII:3.
29. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:XIII:6.
30. Josephus, Antiquities, XIV:XIII:8.
31. M. Aberbach, in "The Historical Allusions of Chapters IV, XI, and XIII of the Psalms of Solomon", p. 391, states the view that this takeover is reflected in the work from chapter XI until the end of the book. Before chapter XI, the Psalms are mostly lamentations, reflecting the people's support of the Parthian invasion and the Sadducee takeover.
32. Solomon Zeitlin, in "Herod: A Malevolent Maniac",



Jewish Quarterly Review, LIV, (July, 1963), p. 6, notes that in this war, Antigonus used the concept of legitimacy in order to gain popular support. He not only questioned Herod's legitimate right to the throne, but he also questioned Herod's legitimacy as a Judean. He claimed that Herod, being an Idumean, was only half Judean. This was an ethnic view held by the Sadducees.

33. Josephus, Antiquities, XV:II:7

34. Josephus, Antiquities, XV:III:3.

35. Ibid.

36. Josephus, Antiquities, XV:VIII:4.

37. Josephus, Antiquities, XV:VIII:8.

38. Josephus, Antiquities, XV:VIII:10.

39. For further information, refer to Menahem Stern's "The Politics of Herod and the Jewish Society Towards the End of the Second Commonwealth", Tarbiz, XXXV, (March, 1966), pp. 235-253.

40. Josephus, Antiquities, XV:VIII:1-4.

41. Menahem Stern, in "A. Schalit's Herod", Journal of Jewish Studies, XI, (1960), p. 55, notes that Herod was greatly influenced by the ideas regarding the ethical and spiritual mission of Rome. This would account for his introduction of foreign practices.

42. For details concerning the Sicarii, and their connection with the Shammaites, see below, pp. 40-42.

43. Josephus, Antiquities, XVII:II:4.

44. Solomon Zeitlin, in "The Essenes and Messianic Expectations", Jewish Quarterly Review, XLV, (October, 1954), p. 101, notes that Herod

exempted the Essenes from this oath because of their doctrine opposing the taking of oaths.

45. Solomon Zeitlin, in "Herod: A Malevolent Maniac", p. 25, states the view that the revolutionary Pharisees were Apocalyptic Pharisees. I feel that the time of this revolt dictates against this view. While there may have been Apocalypitics present at that time, they did not gain popularity until a later period.

46. W.E. Filmer, in "The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great", Journal of Theological Studies, XVII, (October, 1966), p. 293, disagrees with the generally accepted dating of Herod's death. He places Herod's death at 9 January, 1 B.C.E. He retains 4 B.C.E. as the beginning of Archelaus' reign by explaining that in 4 B.C.E., Archelaus was declared co-regent. One of the major problems with this view is that, according to Josephus, Archelaus' reign began after the death of Herod.

Timothy D. Barnes, in "The Date of Herod's Death", Journal of Theological Studies, XIX, (April, 1968), pp. 204-209, opposes Filmer's view in much greater detail.

47. Josephus, Antiquities, XVII:VI:2-4; Wars, I:XXXIII:2-4.



## CHAPTER III

## Sects during the Reign of Archelaus

Archelaus, Herod's successor, ruled Judea between the years 4 B.C.E. and 6 C.E. During his reign, the Shammaite revolution, which began at the end of Herod's life, was expanded. This revolution plagued Archelaus' reign right from the beginning. Before Archelaus was able to leave for Rome, in order to be confirmed as king by Augustus Caesar, riots broke out in Jerusalem.<sup>48</sup> These riots were in protest of the execution of the Shammaite leaders of the group which tore down the Roman eagle from the Temple gate. Archelaus had to resort to violence in order to put down these Shammaite led and inspired riots. Archelaus' action did not suppress his Shammaite opposition permanently. While he was in Rome, more Shammaite riots broke out in Jerusalem.<sup>49</sup> These disturbances were so volatile that they required the military intervention of Varus, the Roman legate of Syria.

Varus' suppression of the Jerusalem riots only temporarily effected the Shammaite revolution. When Sabinus, the temporary imperial governor of Judea, collected taxes from the Temple treasury, the Shammaites inflamed the masses by claiming that he had plundered the Temple. As a result of this Shammaite propaganda, riots broke out once again in Jerusalem. The Shammaites received extensive popular support. At one point, part of Herod's army joined in the revolution. Due to this added support, the Shammaites were able to turn the tide of the revolution decisively in their favor. They

forced Sabinus and the Romans to take shelter in Herod's palace.<sup>50</sup>

Once the revolutionary forces gained the advantage in Jerusalem, the revolution spread to the Galilee.<sup>51</sup> Judah of Galilee led a force which captured the city of Sepphoris. Judah equipped his men with the weapons captured from the Roman garrison there. After Sepphoris was secure, Judah extended his operations throughout the Galilee, using Sepphoris as his main headquarters. There is strong evidence pointing to Judah's association with the Shammaites. He was the son of Hezekiah, the revolutionary executed by Herod when Herod was prefect of the Galilee.<sup>52</sup> This is the same Judah who later founded the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, a revolutionary group with ties to the Shammaites.<sup>53</sup>

Ultimately, Varus had to return to put down the revolution.<sup>54</sup> The extent of the revolution and the power of the Shammaites can be gauged by the fact that in order for Varus to put an end to the revolt, he had to make a deal with the Shammaites, allowing them to send a delegation to Rome in order for them to air their grievances and to request direct Roman control. This request for direct Roman control was a major power play. The Shammaites realized that if they could get the Romans to meet this request, the Romans would have to support them as the major power group. This Shammaite strategy met with only limited success. While Augustus Caesar withheld the title of king from Archelaus, he kept him in office with the title of ethnarch.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, while the revolution secured and may even have bettered the Shammaites' position of power in Judea, the Hillelites

still remained in control.

In 6 C.E., Archelaus was banished to Vienna, in Gaul.<sup>56</sup>  
The effecting of Archelaus' banishment was a Hillelite move to secure and improve their power position in the light of the recent Shammaite gains. By having Archelaus banished, the Hillelites deprived the Shammaites of one of their major appeals to the people, that being the ousting of Archelaus. After Archelaus was banished, Judea was put directly under Roman control. While the plan to have Judea put directly under Roman control was originally a Shammaite one, aimed at bettering the Shammaite position, it was the Hillelites who accomplished this goal. The Hillelites, through these efforts, established themselves as the controlling Jewish party.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER III

48. Josephus, Antiquities, XVII:IX:1-3; Wars, II:I:1-3.

49. Josephus, Wars, II:III:1.

50. Josephus, Wars, II:III:1-V:3.

51. As was noted earlier, Hezekiah's revolution was supported by the dissident Pharisaic group of the time. This group was the positional forerunner of the Shammaites.

53. For further details concerning the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, and their connection with the Shammaites, see below, pp. 26-28.

54. Josephus, Wars, II:VI:1-2.

55. Josephus, Wars, II:VI:3.

56. Josephus, Wars, II:VII:3.

## CHAPTER IV

Judah of Galilee, Zadok the Pharisee,  
 The Founding of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealot Party  
 And the Revolt in Galilee in 6 C.E.

The situation in Judea, after the banishment of Archelaus, and the placing of Judea directly under Roman control, brought about the formation of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealot party. Rome put Judea under the administration of P. Sulpicius Quirinius, legate of Syria, and Coponius, procurator of Judea.<sup>57</sup> This Roman administration, with the aid of the Jewish establishment, as represented by Joazar, the high priest, instituted a census for the purposes of taxation.<sup>58</sup>

The formation of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealot party, by Judah of Galilee and Zadok the Pharisee,<sup>59</sup> was a reaction to the institution of the census.<sup>60</sup> This party associated itself with the Pharisees.<sup>61</sup> They declared themselves as a movement for total independence from Rome.<sup>62</sup> Their ideology was mainly of a religious nature. They believed that there is no ruler, or lord, other than God.<sup>64</sup> The threat of death did not alter their adherence to this doctrine. In defense of this doctrine, they did not fear their own death or the death of relations and friends.<sup>65</sup> They felt that to pay taxes to Rome was both an act of apostasy<sup>66</sup> and submission to slavery.<sup>67</sup> Therefore, they refused, on religious grounds, to submit to Roman sovereignty in word or deed.<sup>68</sup> They believed that they would be victorious in their opposition to Rome because God was on their side.<sup>69</sup>

Judah and Zadok attracted many followers.<sup>70</sup> Under the leadership of Judah, this sect entered into open rebellion against Rome. The revolution failed. Judah was executed,<sup>71</sup> but Zadok's fate is unknown. There is a strong possibility that out of Judah and Zadok's followers, there was a surviving element which fled to safety. This surviving element would account for the fact that the philosophy did not die with the revolt. Another reason for the theory of a surviving element is that later, Judah's sons appear on the Judean scene as leaders of Zealot groups.<sup>72</sup>

The widespread popularity of the Fourth Philosophy would seem to indicate that Judah was backed by a major power group. This power group was probably the Shammaites. Previous attempts made by Judah, and his father, never had materialized into significant revolutions. The fact that Judah was able to mobilize enough people would point to his Shammaite backing. While a minor Pharisaic power group could not have executed such a mobilization, the Shammaites could. The revolution took place in the Galilee, a rural area. The Shammaites, because of their religious conservatism, had large support in the rural areas.

The Shammaites were the only major power group at the time which could gain from such a revolution. Because of such a disturbance occurring under Hillelite control, the Hillelites would lose some favor in the eyes of the Romans. Their power base would be weakened. While the Shammaites knew that victory was impossible, they hoped that the revolution would create enough trouble to put them in a better bargaining position with the Romans and the Hillelites.

The Fourth Philosophy must have been composed by Zadok.

Judah, being a soldier, and not a scholar, was incapable of such a task. While Judah had been a revolutionary before the formation of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealot party, it was not until Zadok appeared that Judah conducted revolutionary activities based on a religious ideology. Zadok was probably the field representative of the Shammaites, sent to the Galilee to create the Fourth Philosophy and to oversee the revolution.

The Shammaites chose Judah as the leader of the revolution for a variety of reasons. He was a good figure head. He was the son of Hezekiah, the leader of the first revolt for independence. In the eyes of the people, he was free from the taint of any previous political affiliations.<sup>73</sup> As a military leader, he was probably the best choice. His ability as a soldier was demonstrated by his capture of Sepphoris in the previous revolt. He had a strong, well-equipped band which provided a nucleus for the revolutionary forces.

The revolt of 6 C.E. can be seen as a two-faceted revolt. It was a Shammaite attempt to improve their power position, at the expense of the Hillelites. It was also an expression, on the part of the people, of the massive discontent with the Roman-Hillelite control of Judea. It was this discontent which the Shammaites used for their own ends.



## Footnotes to CHAPTER IV

57. Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII:I:1; Wars, II:VIII:1.
58. Ibid.
59. Zadok is mentioned only in the Antiquities version.
60. Josephus, Antiquities and Wars, Ibid.
61. Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII:I:6.
62. Ibid.
63. Cecil Roth, in "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", Journal of Semetic Studies, IV, (October, 1959), p. 338, notes that Judah was a revolutionary prior to the founding of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealot party. With the founding of that party, he established theological justification for his political attitudes.
64. Josephus, Antiquities and Wars, Ibid.
65. Ibid.
66. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.
67. Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII:I:1.
68. Cecil Roth, "The Religious Nature of the Zealots", Leo Jung Jubilee Volume, (1962), 203-209.
69. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. Acts, 5:37
72. For further details concerning the activities of Judah's sons, see p. 40.
73. In the revolution during the reign of Archelaus, because of the confusion of the period, Judah's actions were probably viewed as being independent from those of the Shammaites in Jerusalem.



## CHAPTER V

## The Apocalypitics

The Apocalypitics are a sect which probably dates back to the time of Herod.<sup>74</sup> However, their activities were minimal until the period between the revolutions of 6 C.E. and 66 C.E. While they agreed with the Pharisees in most areas, they differed with them in their conception of the redemption through natural processes. The Apocalypitics believed in an immediate supernatural redemption.

There were three basic points to the Apocalyptic ideology. The first point was that the coming of the Messiah, and the establishment of the "kingdom of heaven" was near at hand.<sup>76</sup> This messiah would be of the seed of David. Using the supernatural power he would possess, he would personally oust the Romans and establish the "kingdom of heaven". Their second point was that a massive purification process was necessary in order to bring about the Messiah and the "end of days".<sup>77</sup> For them, purification was a twofold process, involving both ritual purification, which was achieved through baptism, and true repentance. The third point was the acknowledgement of the Lord as the one true ruler.<sup>78</sup> This ideology met the needs of the frustrated, oppressed people. The popularity of the Apocalypitics is evidenced by the messianism which later permeated Judea.<sup>79</sup>

It is probable that there was a relationship, if not a liason between the Apocalypitics and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. Both sects shared the goal of ridding Judea of the Romans. They also

shared the concept of God as the exclusive king. However, they did differ in their approach concerning the "kingdom of heaven". While the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots believed that the "kingdom of heaven" was to be brought about through violent revolution, the Apocalyptics believed the messiah would bring it about, and all the people could do was to prepare for his coming. The Apocalyptics believed that the Temple cult required restructuring. The Fourth Philosophy-Zealots did not speak to this issue. These differences were not insurmountable. It was possible for the Apocalyptics to adjust their stand against violent revolution so as to be more congruous with the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. If the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots could supply them with the right charismatic leader as messiah, the Apocalyptics could supply the ideology of "fighting by the side of the Messiah".

The paradigm for the Apocalyptics was John the Baptist. He preached purification through both baptism and repentance.<sup>80</sup> He travelled throughout Galilee announcing the coming of the messiah.<sup>81</sup> Eventually, John was executed by Herod Antipas.<sup>82</sup> While the New Testament claims that John was executed because of his attack upon Herod Antipas' illegal marriage, Josephus claims that it was because of his widespread popularity. Josephus' version is probably the correct one.<sup>83</sup> John's apocalyptic teachings, compounded by his popularity, were enough to make him a very real threat to the peace of Antipas' tetrarchy. Antipas had no choice but to execute John, for it was his duty to put down all potential revolutions.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER V

74. Solomon Zeitlin, in "Herod: A Malevolent Maniac", p. 25, believes that the Pharisaic group which refused to take a loyalty oath to Rome, during the time of Herod, was the Apocalyptic.

75. Solomon Zeitlin, The Rise and Fall of the Judean State, (Philadelphia, 1959), volume II, p. 320.

76. Ibid.

77. Ibid.

78. Ibid.

79. For further details concerning the Messianists, see below, pp. 33-38.

80. Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII:V:2; Matthew, 3:5-6,8; Mark, 1:4-5; Luke, 3:3, 7-14, 18.

81. Matthew, 3:2, 11-12; Mark, 1:7-8; Luke 3:15-17.

82. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.; Matthew, 14:3-11; Mark 6:17-29; Luke, 3:19-20.

83. J. Duncan M. Derrett in "Herod's Oath and the Baptist's Head", Biblische Zeitschrift, IX, (January and July, 1965) pp. 49-59, 233-246, defends the New Testament account of the execution of John the Baptist.

## CHAPTER VI

## The Messianists and the Pseudo-Messiahs

The sect known as the Messianists was probably an outgrowth of both the Apocalyptic and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. This sect spoke to the same needs of the people as the other two. It offered a tantalizing mixture of features from both. Like the Apocalyptic and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, the Messianists spoke of immediate redemption from the Roman oppression. Out of its Fourth Philosophy-Zealot heritage, it offered an active participation in the redemptive process. From its Apocalyptic background, it offered a supernatural, God-directed redemption.

The Messianists can best be viewed through an investigation of the messianic figures they produced. The most famous was Jesus of Nazareth, whose ministry lasted from 31 C.E. until 34 C.E. There are no reliable historical sources concerning Jesus. The references to him in Josephus appear to be later interpolations. The Gospels, the major sources on this subject, are interested in conveying theology, not history. Mark, the earliest of the Gospels, was written in Rome, around the time of the revolution of 66 C.E. - 73 C.E. It is an apologetic work, aimed at proving that Jesus was not an insurrectionist. The other Synoptic Gospels are based on this work.<sup>84</sup>

Jesus' ministry began after his baptism by John the Baptist.<sup>85</sup> After he had amassed a large enough following, he appointed agents, traditionally twelve in number, known as his apostles.

Eventually, he declared to his apostles that he was the messiah, but ordered them not to divulge his identity.<sup>86</sup> When he entered Jerusalem, he rode on an ass<sup>87</sup> in order to fulfill the prophecy of Zechariah.<sup>88</sup> In Jerusalem, the people cheered him as the messiah.<sup>89</sup> Judas Iscariot, one of his apostles, betrayed him to the authorities.<sup>90</sup> Jesus was arrested on charges of sedition.<sup>91</sup> He was ultimately executed by Pontius Pilate.<sup>92</sup>

The Apocalyptic had a profound influence on Jesus. It was John the Baptist, an Apocalyptic, who baptized him. Like the Apocalyptic, Jesus preached that the "kingdom of God" was at hand.<sup>93</sup> He had his apostles practice baptism.<sup>94</sup> Jesus' persistent attacks on the Pharisees and the Temple were echoes of the Apocalyptic's opposition to the religious institution.

It is possible that a liason existed between Jesus and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.<sup>95</sup> Jesus chose Simon, a Zealot, as one of his apostles.<sup>96</sup> The fact that Simon is singled out as a Zealot would seem to indicate that Jesus himself was not one, but was of a favorable disposition toward them. Mark refers to Simon as "the Cananaean".<sup>97</sup> This title is the Aramaic word for "Zealot". This peculiarity can be explained in terms of Mark's apologetic motives.<sup>98</sup> By using Simon's Aramaic title, Mark hoped to obscure all ties linking Jesus with the Zealots. There is also a possibility that Judas Iscariot, another of the apostles, was a Zealot. The Greek word, "Sicarii", the title of a Zealot group.<sup>99</sup> However, it is more likely that this name is of a fictitious nature. "Judas" could be interpreted as meaning "Jews", and "Iscariot" could be

interpreted as meaning "Sicarii". Taking into account that Judas was the one who betrayed Jesus, this name is probably a symbolic statement communicating the idea that Jesus was betrayed by the Jewish patriots. That Jesus came from Galilee, home of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, is yet another factor contributing to the possibility of such a liason.

If this is the case, Jesus' activities can be viewed as part of a revolutionary plot. The Zealots would supply the mechanisms for such a revolution, while Jesus would be the messianic figure, around whom the people would be mobilized. When Jesus requested his apostles to keep his messianic identity secret, he did so because it was not yet time for the revolution. He first had to enter Jerusalem, so as to mobilize their support there. With this support, the revolutionaries could open a two-front war. Such a strategy would give them a better chance for victory. Yet another reason for Jesus' entry into Jerusalem was to fulfill the messianic prophecies, thus retaining his authenticity as the messiah.

The information surrounding Jesus' trial and execution gives further evidence of his Zealot affiliation. It would seem that since Jesus' fate was linked with that of Barabbas, a known insurrectionist,<sup>100</sup> the Romans must have considered him more of a threat than Barabbas.<sup>101</sup> It was a common Roman practice to condemn Zealots to death by crucifixion.<sup>102</sup> He was crucified with two "Lestai", of "robbers".<sup>103</sup> The title, "Lestai" cannot be taken literally. Crucifixion is too heavy a penalty for the crime of theft. In understanding this incident, it must be remembered that Josephus referred to the Zealots as "Lestai."



Therefore, these "robbers" must have been Zealots. Jesus' interaction with these two men is another indicator of his attitude toward the Zealots. Jesus assured them that they would get into heaven.<sup>104</sup> There is no record of his ever giving anyone else this assurance. The fact that he made such a promise to Zealots would indicate his strong support of their cause.<sup>105</sup>

Jesus' identification with the Zealots did not end with his death. There is a strong possibility that his followers retained their Zealot affiliation. It is to be noted that Paul, one of the apostles, was later accused of being a member of the Sicarii.<sup>106</sup>

Jesus was not the only messianic figure of the period between the revolutions of 6 C.E. and 66 C.E. During the procuratorship of Fadus, which lasted from 44 C.E. until 46 C.E. another messianic figure arose, in the person of Theudas.<sup>107</sup> As the Messiah, Theudas planned to redeem the Jews by organizing a mass exile from Judea. His messiahship was widely accepted. Styling himself after Moses, he took his followers to the Jordan River, promising them that it would split, like the Red Sea and afford them a dry passage out of the province of Judea. Fadus, realizing the danger of such a movement presented, sent troops to intercept Theudas and his party. Many were killed in this confrontation. Theudas was captured and beheaded.

During the procuratorship of Felix, (52 C.E.-60 C.E.) another messianic figure arose. This messiah, whose name is unknown, came from Egypt.<sup>108</sup> His plan for the redemption of the Jews involved the



capture of Jerusalem. With a force of 30,000 men, he camped on the Mount of Olives, in preparation for the attack. Felix successfully put down this uprising, slaying most of the 30,000. The Egyptian and few of his followers escaped.<sup>109</sup>

The popularity of these messianic figures reflects the widespread discontent of the times. They are also an indicator of the success of the Shammaite propaganda against the Romans and the Hillelites. The Messianists, while probably not Shammaites, were able to utilize to their own advantage the discontent and antagonism the Shammaites were spreading throughout Judea. The Shammaites did not mind the success of such movements. By inflaming the people with a revolutionary zeal, these messianic figures served the Shammaite ends. These messianic movements served the Shammaites in yet another way. They weakened the Hillelite power base through their success.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER VI

84. S. G. F. Brandon, "Jesus and the Zealots; Aftermath",  
Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LIV, (Autumn, 1971), pp. 53-54

85. Matthew, 3:13-16; Mark, 1:9; Luke, 3:21.

86. Matthew, 6:16; Mark, 8:29-30.

87. Mark, 11:1-10

88. Zechariah, 9:9.

89. Matthew, 21:9; Mark, 11:9-10.

90. Matthew, 26:47-48; Mark, 14:43-44; Luke, 22:3-4, 47-48

91. S. G. F. Brandon, in "Jesus and the Zealots", Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society, volume II, pp. 15-17, notes that the apostles were armed and gave resistance to the soldiers arresting Jesus.

92. S. G. F. Brandon, in "Jesus and the Zealots", pp. 14-15, points out that the representation of Pilate, found in the Gospels, as being a man of weak character, afraid of the Jews, is in direct contradiction to Josephus' picture of him.

93. Mark, 1:15.

94. Matthew, 28:19; Acts, 2:38; 8:12-13.

95. S.G.F. Brandon, in "Jesus and the Zealots", p. 19, notes that the Gospels are too silent about Jesus' relations with the Zealots, while they describe his hostile relations with the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

96. Luke, 6:15; Acts, 1:13.

97. Mark, 3:18.

98. S. G. F. Brandon, in "Jesus and the Zealots", p. 18, notes that the use of this Aramaic term was departure from Mark's general practice of translating Aramaic terms and explaining Jewish customs.

99. S. G. F. Brandon, "Jesus and the Zealots", p. 18.

100. Mark, 15:7-11.

101. S. B. F. Brandon, Jesus and the Zealots. (Manchester, 1967), pp. 263-264.

102. S. G. F. Brandon, "Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath", p. 65.

103. Mark, 15:27.

104. Luke, 23:43.

105. S. G. F. Brandon, in "Jesus and the Zealots", p. 13, notes that to say Jesus was not involved in the nationalistic movement is tantamount to calling him unpatriotic and indifferent to the suffering and the struggling of his countrymen. To say that he was concerned solely with the spiritual is to represent him as being unrealistic for a first century Judean.

106. Acts, 21:38.

107. Josephus, Antiquities, XX:V:1.

108. Josephus, Wars. II:XIII:5.

109. Cecil Roth, in "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", p. 339, states the view that this Egyptian had originally joined the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, but later had originally broke with them and started his own movement. Roth feels that he is the "Preacher of Lies" of the Habakkuk Commentary.

## CHAPTER VII

## The Militant Sects

During the Period prior to the Revolution of 66 C.E.

There is evidence indicating that the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots remained active during the period between the two revolutions of 6 C.E. and 66 C.E. During the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander, (46 C.E.-48 C.E.) James and Simon, two sons of Judah of Galilee, the founder of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, were executed.<sup>110</sup>

For them to merit execution, they must have been following in their father's footsteps. According to Josephus,<sup>111</sup> the procurator Felix<sup>112</sup> destroyed a Fourth Philosophy-Zealot group under the leadership of one Eleazar.

After Felix had defeated the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, a new group of Zealots arose, known as the Sicarii.<sup>113</sup> This group derived its title from the Latin word, "Sica", meaning "curved dagger". This was the weapon they used. The fact that Josephus, who wrote in Greek, used the Latin term, "Sicarii", to describe them, suggests that this title was given by the Roman occupation forces.

The Sicarii were basically political assassins operating in Jerusalem.<sup>114</sup> They used short daggers, which they concealed in their clothing. There was a definite pattern to their assassinations. They murdered their victims during festival periods. Their victims were Jews collaborating with the Romans. These executions occurred in the daytime, always in public. After an assassination, they would join the ranks of those showing indignation. Their activities

created extreme fear among their opponents.

Jonathan, the high priest, was the first victim to fall under a Sicarii dagger.<sup>115</sup> During the procuratorship of Festus, which lasted from 60 C.E. until 62 C.E., the Sicarii expanded their operations to include the plundering of the neighboring villages of their enemies.<sup>116</sup> During the procuratorship of Albinus, (62 C.E.-64 C.E.) they kidnapped the scribe of Eleazar, governor of the Temple and son of Ananias, the high priest.<sup>117</sup> The scribe was ransomed for the release of Sicarii prisoners. This was only the first of many such kidnappings.

The Sicarii were probably a sect akin, but not identical to the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.<sup>118</sup> They arose after the suppression of a Zealot group which must have been Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, since prior to that time, Josephus never notes any other type of Zealots. It must be remembered that Josephus refers to the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots as "robbers" (Lestai), and never before this point, as "Sicarii". Josephus referred to them as "another sort of robbers", apparently to differentiate them from the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.<sup>119</sup> It must also be remembered that the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots operated mainly in Galilee, while the Sicarii operated mainly in Jerusalem.<sup>120</sup> A final point of differentiation is that the Sicarii conducted their activities in a manner totally different from that of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.

The Sicarii were obviously an anti-Sadducean sect. Among their victims is found Jonathan, the high priest, and a Sadducee. The kidnapping of Eleazar's scribe was yet another action directed against

Sadducees.

It is very likely that the Sicarii emerged from the Shammaite party. Their policy of killing violators of Jewish law had support in Shammaite ideology.<sup>121</sup> The Shammaites had the most to gain from the Sicarii policy of Assassination. The victims of the Sicarii were Jewish collaborators. Such individuals could most readily be found among the Sadducees and the Hillelites. In effect, the Sicarii were eliminating the opponents of the Shammaites.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER VII

110. Josephus, Antiquities, XX:V:2.
111. Josephus, Wars, II:XIII:2.
112. As previously noted, Felix ruled Judea from 52 C.E. to 60 C.E.
113. Josephus, Wars, II:XIII:3.
114. Josephus, Antiquities, XX:VIII:10; Wars, Ibid.
115. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.
116. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.
117. Josephus, Antiquities, XX:IX:3.
118. Both Solomon Zeitlin, in "The Sicarii and Masada",  
Quarterly Review, volume LVII, p. 251, and Cecil Roth, in his article,  
 "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", p. 333, feel that the Sicarii  
 are identical with the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.
119. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.
120. Cecil Roth, in "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", p. 337,  
 considers the Sicarii as an urban form of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.
121. Babylonian Talmud, Shabbat, 17a.



# CHAPTER VIII

## The Disturbances in Jerusalem

During the Procuratorship of Florus (64 C.E.-66 C.E.)

As the Final Preparatory Stage

For a Shammaite inspired and led Revolution

The revolution of 66 C.E.-73 C.E. was the result of a Shammaite plot to overthrow the Hillelites, gaining control of the Jewish government in Judea for themselves, through the strategy of executing a controlled revolution. The Shammaites, realizing that a complete revolution, one which they could bring to a halt after they had obtained their objectives. What the Shammaites desired from this revolution was that it should be large enough to bring the Hillelites and the Romans to the negotiating table, while at the same time, convincing the Romans that the Shammaite power base was so strong that it would be politically advantageous to Rome to have the Shammaites replace the Hillelites as the controlling power in Judea.

The Shammaites and their positional forerunners had put a great deal of effort in preparing for this ultimate revolution. Their preparations probably began with their support of Hezekiah's revolution. Their support of the Hasmoneans against Herod had split the country and had created, among the people, a great deal of discontent with the Hillelite establishment. Throughout the reign of Herod, they had kept the country in a continual state of unrest. By their revolts against Archelaus, they kept dissatisfaction burning in the hearts of the people. For this purpose, they inspired and supported the formation

of the Sicarii was one of the culminating points of this program. Through this group they attempted to demonstrate that the victimizers of the people could most definitely be made the victims. Once the success of the Sicarii had been established, the Shammaites were ready for the final preparatory stage.

The disturbances in Jerusalem during the procuratorship of Florus, directly preceding the outbreak of the revolution, constituted this final stage. The Shammaites rallied the people against Florus, claiming he had stolen from the Temple treasury.<sup>122</sup> This charge was probably a distortion of a perfectly legitimate tax collection on Florus' part. The Shammaites knew that by accusing Florus of desecrating the Temple, they could quickly arouse considerable popular support. As a result of the ensuing disturbances Florus held an investigation.<sup>123</sup> The failure of this tribunal indicates that the Shammaites were strong. For the Hillelites to betray the leaders of these riots would alienate a vast majority of the people, thereby destroying the Hillelite power position.

In spite of Florus' investigation, the Shammaite-led riots continued. Florus' troops were forced to engage in what appears to have been a large number of Jerusalemites in combat in the Upper City.<sup>124</sup> To put down these disturbances, Florus had to go so far as to execute a number of Jews of the equestrian order.<sup>125</sup> These executions suggest that the Shammaites could obtain support among some of the leading elements in Judean society. This assumption can be made on the basis of several factors. The Romans honored only

the leading elements of society with inclusion in the equestrian order. If such Jews were punished, they must have been supporting the riots. The Romans would not have punished those Jews who were friendly to their cause. These Jews probably perceived of the Shammaites' position as being so strong as to be successful. They probably joined with the Shammaites to insure their future.

The disturbances reached such a peak that Florus had to call for reinforcements from Cesarea.<sup>126</sup> When these reinforcements arrived in Jerusalem, the Shammaites led the people in an attack upon them.<sup>127</sup> Incapable of quelling the riots, Florus left Jerusalem, taking with him most of his Roman troops, and leaving the city in the hands of the pro-Roman Hillelites.<sup>128</sup> By withdrawing from Jerusalem, Florus probably hoped that the disturbances would abate. He was attempting to buy time until a more adequate Roman force could be called in. This withdrawal indicates a Shammaite success.

Once out of Jerusalem, Florus reported the revolt to his superior, Cestius Gallus, legate of Syria.<sup>129</sup> The Hillelites also reported to Cestius Gallus, but in their report, they denounced Florus.<sup>130</sup> This was probably an attempt on their part to undermine the Shammaites by co-opting their stand against Florus, thereby also co-opting some of their supporters. It was also a declaration of their loyalty to Rome. Through this declaration, they probably aimed at securing their position once the revolt was suppressed.

As a result of these reports, Cestius Gallus intervened.<sup>131</sup> by sending Neopolitanus to Jerusalem. Contrary to Josephus' account

of the events, this intervention was probably of a military nature. It is only logical that, with riots in Jerusalem, Cestius must have sent troops. If the Jerusalemites were as incensed as Josephus describes they were, it is doubtful that Neopolitanus would have been welcomed in the city. When Neopolitanus sent Cestius a favorable report, it must have been one of a military victory.

Neopolitanus' suppression of the revolt in Jerusalem provided only a temporary respite. The Shammaites used Florus' continuation in the procuratorship to again rally the people behind them. There was only a brief passage of time before the major revolution commenced.<sup>132</sup>

## Footnotes to CHAPTER VIII

122. Josephus, Wars, II:XIV:6.

123. Josephus, Wars, II:XIV:8.

124. Josephus, Wars, II:XIV:9.

125. Ibid.

126. Josephus, Wars, II:XV:3.

127. Josephus, Wars, II:XV:5-6; This is a reinterpretation of the report of this event as found in Josephus. This reinterpretation is necessary because Josephus, with his pro-Roman, apologetic, bias, has colored this event to such a degree that his version is more legend than fact. This is an attempt to sift out the facts, discarding the legend.

128. Josephus, Wars, II:XV:6.

129. Josephus, Wars, II:XVI:1.

130. Ibid.

131. Josephus, Wars, II:XVI:1-2.

132. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:1-2.

## CHAPTER IX

## The Successful Initiation of the Revolution of 66 C.E.-73 C.E.

## As the Result of the Formation of

## A Shammaite-led Confederation

## Of Dissident Sects

The Shammaites realized that the only hope their revolution had for success was to be found in the mobilization of a vast majority of the people to their side. In order to achieve this goal, they were instrumental in the formation of a confederation of all the dissident sects in Judea. This confederation was possible because each member sect shared the common goal of liberating Judea from the oppressive Roman and Hillelite control. Included in this confederation was a group of second echelon Sadducees, as evidenced by the act of rebellion on the part of Eleazar, governor of the Temple and son of Ananias, the high priest.<sup>133</sup> This Sadducee group probably wanted to take the control of the Temple out of the hands of the Hillelite-backed Sadducees. It was quite possible for the Shammaites to have promised Eleazar and his group in return for their cooperation, a greater measure of control of the Temple and would have a freer hand in its management than did the Hillelite-backed Sadducees.

It is evident that this Sadducee contingent worked in conjunction with the Shammaites. Both these groups took a stringent view of the law, as evidenced by their attitude toward Caesar's sacrifices. In the beginning of the revolution, there was no obvious controversy between Eleazar's Sadducees and the Shammaite Sicarii. The fact that Eleazar

appears to have been accepted as the head of the insurrectionists in Jerusalem would seem to indicate that the Shammaites needed him for his image as a high Temple official to rally the continued support of the people.

The Fourth Philosophy-Zealots was another member sect of the confederation, as evidenced by Menahem's attack on Masada and his entrance into Jerusalem in order to aid the insurrectionists there.<sup>134</sup> To obtain their membership, the Shammaites probably deceived them into believing that the goal of the revolution was nothing short of total independence. Membership in the confederation was to the benefit of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. They realized that the size and widespread popularity of the confederation offered the only real hope for the accomplishment of their goal of ridding Judea of the Romans. It was only through membership in the confederation that they could free themselves of their outlaw status.

Once the confederation was formed, they initiated the revolt, using the strategy of opening two fronts simultaneously,<sup>135</sup> the Negev and Jerusalem. By conducting such a war, they hoped to split the available Roman forces and create confusion within the Roman camp. This strategy counted on the Romans' directing most of their attention to Jerusalem, thus giving Menahem and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots an opportunity to capture Masada, equip themselves from the armory there, and then reinforce the insurrectionists in Jerusalem before it was too late. The success of this strategy depended upon split-second timing and quick, decisive victories. This was important for two reasons.



The insurrectionists had to obtain their objectives before the Romans could fully mobilize. Such quick, decisive victories would hearten the people, thereby help to rally further support throughout Judea.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER IX

133. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:2.
134. Josephus, Wars, Ibid., 8.
135. Ibid.

## CHAPTER X

## The Qumran Sect as Essenes

## And their Incorporation into the Confederation

While the Shammaites, the Hillelites, the Sadducees, the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, the Sicarii, the Apocalyptic, and the Messianists were all deeply involved in the social upheaval of the period, there existed another sect which appears to have withdrawn from the chaos. That sect was the Essenes. Josephus seems to have been fascinated by this sect, for he described it in great detail.<sup>136</sup>

The Essenes had their own philosophical system. They believed that fate governs all things.<sup>137</sup> According to their tenets, the body is of corruptible nature.<sup>138</sup> The body imprisons and corrupts the immortal soul.<sup>139</sup> When freed from this body, the soul rejoices and mounts upward.<sup>140</sup> The soul must overcome the corrupting influences of the body. The soul is either divinely rewarded or punished on the basis of its success in this endeavor.<sup>141</sup> In light of their doctrines concerning the soul, they prized virtue.<sup>142</sup> For the individual, the conquest of the passions<sup>143</sup> and the rejection of evil<sup>144</sup> were major factors in his striving for virtue. These beliefs manifested themselves in the extreme piety of the members of the sect.<sup>145</sup> These people were so dedicated that they put themselves above pain and were ready to die, if their suffering would be for the glory of their beliefs.<sup>146</sup>

The manner in which they conducted their lives was unique for Judea of their time. They set themselves apart from society.<sup>147</sup>

Even though they had a colony in every city,<sup>148</sup> they strove to retain a certain social distance from the rest of the Judeans. They held all possessions in common.<sup>149</sup> Their communal economy, in conjunction with their diffusion throughout the Judean state, made it possible for them to travel throughout the land, carrying nothing with them but their weapons.<sup>150</sup> As part of this communal system, they never bought or sold to one another, but rather shared with one another freely.<sup>151</sup> They appointed stewards to collect all income and manage the communal economy.<sup>152</sup>

Their relationship to the Temple in Jerusalem was of a peculiar nature.<sup>153</sup> While they sent to the Temple what they had dedicated to God, they never offered sacrifices there.<sup>154</sup> Instead, they offered their own sacrifices. They were excluded from the common court of the Temple because of this refusal to offer sacrifices there.

Their dress was uniform and regulated. They wore white garments,<sup>155</sup> which they did not change until they were entirely worn out.<sup>156</sup> Concerned with the welfare of their bodies, they took care of them to the extreme.<sup>157</sup> They considered the anointing of the body with oil, a symbol of wealth, to be a defilement.<sup>158</sup>

They had highly organized daily routine.<sup>159</sup> Before sunrise, they involved themselves totally in prayer, forbidding the discussion of profane matters. After sunrise, they went about their work until the time before lunch, when they took ritual baths. They changed out of their work cloths for the meal.<sup>160</sup> No one was permitted to eat before grace was said. The meal was conducted in an orderly fashion and eaten in silence. After lunch, they changed back into their work.

clothes, and worked until supper. Supper was conducted in much the same manner as lunch.

They were meticulous about the observance of the Sabbath.<sup>161</sup> They were extremely strict about refraining from any form of labor on that day. Everything they needed for the Sabbath was prepared by them the day before.

Taking their word seriously, they rejected the taking of oaths.<sup>162</sup> They considered everything they said to be the equivalent of an oath. Their extreme loyalty, in this regard, was famous throughout Judea. They considered swearing worse than perjury, and believed that if the taking of an oath was necessary, it was worthless.<sup>163</sup>

They had a high regard for study. They took great pains in their studies to find out what is best for the soul.<sup>164</sup> It was believed that through their studies, they acquired the ability to foretell the future.<sup>165</sup> Besides, from their sacred studies, they involved themselves in the study of medicine,<sup>166</sup> and were quite advanced in the medical arts.<sup>167</sup>

They were opposed to having servants because they felt that servants created a temptation to be unjust.<sup>168</sup> While their attitude toward marriage was not uniform, most of them rejected wedlock.<sup>169</sup> While they did not absolutely reject the fitness of marriage, they guarded themselves from lascivious behavior.<sup>170</sup> They also felt that wives created domestic quarrels.<sup>171</sup> From the reasons Josephus gives for their rejection of marriage, other reasons can be surmised. In Jewish law, wedlock is closely connected with the laws of impurity.<sup>172</sup> It is not surprising, considering the Essenes' preoccupation with cleanliness, that they would

avoid marriage. It is to be noted that women in the ancient world were looked upon as untrustworthy.<sup>173</sup> In viewing women thus, the Essenes would consider women unworthy of admission to their sect.

There did exist an order of Essene which condoned marriage.<sup>174</sup> This order differed in no other way from the rest of the Essenes. They believed that by not marrying, they cut off their prospect of succession. For a woman to be considered an acceptable wife, she had to pass a test which lasted three years. In order to demonstrate that they did not marry for reasons of pleasure, but rather for propagation, they did not permit husbands to have sex with their wives while the women were pregnant.

As a function of their rigorous life style and their demanding philosophy, the Essenes kept high admission standards.<sup>175</sup> The new applicant had to live like an Essene, while at the same time remain excluded from the community, for a period of one year. After that year, if he had proven himself, he was allowed to partake in the ritual baths, but he still remained excluded from the general community. He kept this status for two more years. If he was found acceptable after this period, he had to take several oaths before his final admission. There were ten such oaths, being pledges to exercise piety towards God, to observe justice towards all men, to abstain from harming anyone, to hate the wicked and aid the righteous, to show fidelity to all men, especially those in authority, never to abuse his authority or try to outshine others in garments or finery, to be a lover of truth, reproving those who tell lies, never to steal, never

to conceal anything from members of his sect or to reveal any of thier doctrines to others, at the cost of his own life, and to preserve the books belonging to the sect.

The Essene society was highly structured. There were four classes of Essenes. The junior classes were so inferior to the seniors that the touch of a junior would a defile a senior.<sup>176</sup> The juniors needed the permission of their seniors before doing all but two acts, to give assistance where it was desired and to show mercy.<sup>177</sup>

The Essenes administered their own judicial system.<sup>178</sup> In this area, they were famous for accuracy and justice. When they held a trial, their court consisted of at least one hundred members. Decisions were made according to a majority vote. Once sentences were passed, they were unalterable. The punishment for major crimes was expulsion from the order.<sup>179</sup> Those expelled, being heavily restricted by their oaths, usually died. Out of compassion, the sect re-admitted many of those expelled, when they were near death.

The Essenes were probably a Pharisaic group. Their shared many similar points of philosophy. Like the Pharisee, the Essenes believed in fate, but to a extreme degree. Both sects shared a belief in the immortality of the soul. While the Essenes appear to have been more specific than the Pharisees, they both believed in divine reward and punishment. The Essenes, as reflected by their opposition to the Temple cult, seem to have shared the Pharisaic anti-Sadducean stand.

The development of the Essenes was probably a reaction to the social conditions in Judea. Theirs was a life style of excapism.<sup>180</sup> They



removed themselves from the mainstream of society and its problems. At a time when the people of Judea felt great economic pressures, the Essenes set up a socialistic system as a means of finding relief. Their simple and uniform dress indicates a desire, on their part, to keep life simple and uniform. Another indicator was their extensively organized and regulated daily routine.<sup>181</sup> It is not unlikely that one of the major factors in their general rejection of marriage was the avoidance of the problems inherent in that institution.

Many of the Essenes' activities can be viewed as attempts to find alternative means of fulfillment in their lives. Their extensive studying and their extreme piety were manifestations of this search for fulfillment.

The origins of this sect has remained a mystery. Some scholars believe that the Essenes were the Hasidim of the Hasmonean revolution.<sup>182</sup> Others disagree with this theory.<sup>183</sup> It is most likely that this sect was a group of Pharisaic extremists which developed as a product of the Pharisee-Saducee controversies of the Hasmonean period. This theory would account for both their strong Pharisaic tendencies and their opposition to the Sadducees and the Temple cult. Their rejection of the Pharisaic and Sadducean power elements ruling that society. There is no reason to believe that this sect developed any earlier than the time of those controversies.

It is probable that this sect did not gain popularity until the Roman period. It was not until that time, when a great number of the people felt the frustrations inherent in Judean society, that their form of escapism would come into vogue. The sudden upsurge of their

popularity would explain their rigid admission standards. The Essenes took their way of life seriously. They would have been afraid that many of their applicants were turning to them for questionable motives. Therefore, they would have set high admissions standards in an attempt to retain the purity of their sect.

At the outset of the revolution of 66 C.E., when Menahem, the son of Judah of Galilee, and his band of Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, marched down into the Negev and captured Masada they came in contact with a peculiar community of Jews which lived at Qumran.<sup>184</sup> This community was responsible for at least the preservation, if not the authorship, of the texts known as the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>185</sup> The question of who these Qumran Jews were has been a matter of debate among scholars.<sup>186</sup> The assumption that they were Essenes is probably the correct one. Most of what is known of their life style and beliefs comes from the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>187</sup> The description of the community in these texts parallels Josephus' description of the Essenes. These Jews were not tied to one place, as demonstrated by their "Code for Camp Communities", found in the Damascus Document. They had a communal economic system.<sup>188</sup> They had a highly structured class system.<sup>189</sup> They had overseers similar to the curators of the Essenes.<sup>190</sup> They had highly organized meals.<sup>191</sup> They dedicated themselves to their studies.<sup>192</sup> The obligations of the members of this community were similar to those stated in the admission vows of the Essenes.<sup>193</sup> They were opposed to the taking of oaths.<sup>194</sup> Their admissions process was similar to those stated in the admission vows of the Essenes.<sup>195</sup>

They were totally committed to God.<sup>196</sup> They practiced ritual ablutions.<sup>197</sup> They observed the Sabbath laws in a most stringent manner.<sup>198</sup> They believed in the concept of divine reward and punishment of the soul.<sup>199</sup>

There is very little known about the history of this community. Archaeological evidence seems to indicate that this group of Jews inhabited the area of Qumran during separate periods. The first period lasted from around the year 110 B.C.E. until the reign of Herod, around 37 B.E.C.<sup>200</sup> This period seems to have been ended by a severe earthquake, such as the one described by Josephus.<sup>201</sup> The second period lasted from the beginning of the first century C.E. until the year 68 C.E. Archaeological evidence indicates that the community was destroyed by the Roman Tenth Legion, under Vespasian.<sup>202</sup> This evidence suggests that this community was first established during the reign of John Hyrcanus, around the time of his split with the Pharisees.<sup>203</sup> The destruction of the community by the Romans would seem to indicate that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written before 68 C.E.<sup>204</sup>

It is probable that Menahem made a liason with the Qumran Essenes when he was at Masada. He may even have convinced them to join the confederation. Such participation in the revolution of 66 C.E.-73 C.E. finds much documentation. Texts similar to those at Qumran, were found at Masada.<sup>205</sup> Josephus acknowledges Zealot participation in the revolution. He points out that many Essenes suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Romans.<sup>206</sup> He also notes that an Essene by the name of John was appointed a general in the revolutionary forces.<sup>207</sup>

There were many similarities between the Fourth Philosophy-

Zealots and the Essenes which would have facilitated Manahem's efforts in winning the inhabitants of Qumran to the side of the revolutionaries. Both groups were of Pharisaic origin. They shared a willingness to die for their beliefs. One of the basic doctrines for both groups was an extreme loyalty to God. These common points could have opened the way for Manahem to enter into discourse with the Qumran Essenes, and eventually win them over.

There are several points in the Essene ideology which would have allowed for the collaboration of the Qumran Essenes with the Fourth-Philosophy-Zealots. The Essenes had a great regard for justice. If they considered the Romans unjust, they could have viewed the revolutionaries as trying to re-establish God's justice in Judea. One of the vows of the Essenes was to hate the wicked and aid the righteous. They could have interpreted this as an injunction to hate the Romans by aiding the revolutionaries. As lovers of truth and reprovers of lies, they could have conceived their obligation as the upholding of Judaism and truth at all costs, and reprove the lies of Roman paganism.

There are points in Essene ideology which would appear to have militated against their joining the revolution. However, these points could have been interpreted away. One was the injunction against harming anyone. Since it is known that the Essenes carried weapons when they traveled, a precedent must have been already set establishing self-defense as an area outside this regulation. A war with the Roman invaders could be considered self-defense. Another way to override this injunction was to declare that the priority of the command-

ment aided the righteous against the wicked. They also could have circumvented this injunction by aiding the revolutionaries without actively fighting. Another point militating against their involvement in the revolution was the injunction to show fidelity to all men, especially those in authority. One of the ways they could have dealt with this point was to question the authority of the Romans over and against the authority of God, just as the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots did. This injunction could have been viewed as being only in reference to authority within the Essene community, since it is followed by the injunction not to abuse authority. The only place an Essene would have had authority would have been within his community. If the injunction against the abuse of authority referred only to those in authority in the Essene community. They could have also declared this injunction void when the authority in question was of a wicked nature.

There were many reasons for the merger of Qumran Essenes with the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. Both groups were discontented with the social conditions of the times. While the Qumran Essenes responded to these conditions by withdrawing from society, the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots responded by attempting to change them through revolution. Such a merger was to the benefit of Menahem and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. Menahem needed all the allies he could get. Due to the respect of the people for the piety of the Essenes, their support would be good for the public image of the revolution. The Qumran Essenes could provide Menahem's garrison at Masada. The Essenes, being a literary sect, could supply the literature presenting the revolution as God's cause. This merger

was also beneficial for the Essenes. Menahem could supply the protection to keep their community closed and separated from the rest of the society, especially the Romans. Through his actions, Menahem offered to bring about their common goals. The Essenes probably also realized that their refusal to join the confederation would result in their destruction. Being so close to Masada, they would be regarded as a threat to the garrison there. As such, the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots would be forced to destroy them. If they refused to cooperate, Menahem would take the provisions he needed by force. By the time Menahem left the Negev for Jerusalem, the Essenes found themselves deeply involved in the struggle.



## Footnotes to CHAPTER X

136. A description of the Essenes is also found in another text, known as the Philosophumena. However, according to both Morton Smith, in "The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena", Hebrew Union Annual, XXIX, (1958), pp. 273-313, and Solomon Zeitlin, in "The Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena", Jewish Quarterly Review, XLIX, (1958-1959), pp. 292-300, the Philosophumena version is based upon Josephus' version.

137. Josephus, Antiquities, XIII:VI:9; XVIII:I:5.

138. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:11.

139. Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII:I:5; Wars, Ibid.

140. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.

141. Ibid.

142. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.

143. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:2,6.

144. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:2.

145. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:9.

146. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:10.

147. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.

148. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:4.

149. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid; Wars, II:VIII:3.

150. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:4.

151. Ibid.

152. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.

153. Ibid.



154. Solomon Zeitlin, in "The Essenes and Messianic Expectations", p. 93, explains that the Essenes did not offer sacrifices at the Temple because they did not recognize the legitimacy of the high priests. This conflict started when Simon, a Hasmonean, and not of the house of Zadok, declared himself high priest.

155. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:3.

156. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:4.

157. Ibid.

158. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:3.

159. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:5.

160. J. Van Der Ploeg, in "The Meals of the Essenes", Journal of Semetic Studies, II, (1957), pp. 163-175, notes that there is very little evidence to support the view held by many scholars that the meals of the Essenes were actually "sacred" meals. He feels that the views of these scholars are too far-reaching, based on a minimum of information.

161. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:9.

162. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:6.

163. As previously mentioned, Solomon Zeitlin, in "The Essenes and Messianic Expectations", p. 101, notes that the Essenes were exempt from the taking of the loyalty oath to Rome, during the reign of Herod, because of this doctrinal rejection of oaths in general.

164. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.

165. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:12.

166. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:6.

167. Ralph Marcus, in "'Tree of Life' in Essene (?) Tradition", Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV, (1955), p. 274, states that there is a possibility that in Essene literature, "Tree of Life: (Ets Hayyim) actually refers to some sort of healing herb.

168. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.

169. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:2.

170. Ibid.

171. Josephus, Antiquities, Ibid.

172. Solomon Zeitlin, "The Essenes and Messianic Expectations", p. 101.

173. Ibid.

174. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:13.

175. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:7.

176. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:10.

177. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:6.

178. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:9.

179. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:8.

180. Theodor H. Gaster, in The Dead Sea Scriptures, (1964), pp. 8-9, states the view that their excapism had theological overtones.

181. J.F. Smith, in "Tyros in Philo on the Essenes = ἡ πόλις?", Biblica, XL, (1959), p. 1024, states the view that those who joined the Essenes did not need the stricture of law because, through extreme self-discipline, they were already able to govern themselves. I feel that this is far from the case. Those who joined the Essenes needed the security found in a system which regulated every aspect of their existence.

182. Among the scholars holding this view is Solomon Zeitlin, as expressed in "The Essenes and Messianic Expectations", pp. 87-90. Zeitlin holds that the title "Essenes" comes from the Aramaic word "Hasin", which is the equivalent of the Hebrew word "Hasidim". He also bases his theory on the fact that Josippon used the title "Hasidim" wherever Josephus spoke of the Essenes. He claims that Josephus derived the title "Essenes" from the "hoshien" which the high priest wore, which Josephus called "essen". This was supposed to give the person who wore it the power of prophecy. Since Josephus attributed this power to the members of this sect, he called them Essenes. He also notes that Philo called the Essenes by the title "Essaioi", which is a derivative of the Greek word for piety. The equivalent title in Hebrew would be "Hasidiei". Philo must have known them by this title.

Another scholar who holds this view is Charles T. Fritsch, in "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community", Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV, (1955), p. 177.

183. Among the scholars who hold the view that the origins of the Essenes is not to be found in the Hasidim of the Hasmonean revolution is L. Kabinowitz, as expressed in "The First Essenes", Journal of Semitic Studies, IV (1959), pp. 358-361. He finds fault in the identification of the group that went into the wilderness and were later slain because they refused to violate the Sabbath, during the Hasmonean revolution, as the Hasidim. The Hasidim, he feels, were a militant group. The group that went into the wilderness were the original Essenes.

Another such scholar is Matthew Black. In "The Patristic Account of Jewish Sectarianism", Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XLI (1959), pp. 292, 296, and 298, he states the view that the Qumran sect, which he identifies as Essenes, were an opposition party to the established Pharisees and Sadducees. This would date their origins as being no earlier than the reign of Simon. He notes a close relationship between them and the Samaritans. He feels this relationship indicates that the origins of the Essenes is to be found in the ancient religion of the Northern Kingdom.

184. Cecil Roth, in "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", p. 337, stated the view that the Qumran community was actually made up of Menahem and his band of Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. He bases this theory on the idea that they, being outlaws, had to isolate themselves while Judea was under Roman rule. The site of Qumran was excellent for their purposes.

185. Theodor H. Gaster, in The Dead Sea Scriptures, p. 3, points out that it does not necessarily follow that because the Qumran community read and cherished the Scrolls, they composed all of them.

186. Cecil Roth, "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", Charles T. Fritsch, "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community", Matthew Black, "The Patristic Account of Jewish Sectarianism", Ralph Marcus, in "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics", Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII, (1954), pp. 160-161, states they were a group of Essenes related to both the Apocalyptic Pharisees and the Jewish Gnostics.

187. Theodor H. Gaster, in The Dead Sea Scriptures, pp. 3-4, states that the community described in the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus (Zadokite) Document was probably not their community,

but rather, their ideal of a community. This would explain some of the differences between the community as described in these texts and Josephus' description of the Essenes.

188. Manual of Discipline, I:1-15, Damascus Document, XIV:12-18.

189. Manual of Discipline, VI:1-8; Damascus Document, XIV:3-12.

190. Damascus Document, XIII:7-19.

191. Manual of Discipline, Ibid.

192. Ibid.

193. Damascus Document, VI:11-VII:6a.

194. Damascus Document, VI:1-XVI:20.

195. Manual of Discipline, VI:13-23.

196. Manual of Discipline, V:7-20.

197. Damascus Document, X:10-13.

198. Damascus Document, X:14-XI:18.

199. Damascus Document, IV:6-12, VII:9-VIII:21, XX:27-34.

200. Charles T. Fritsch. "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community",  
p. 175

201. Josephus, Antiquities, XV:V:2.

202. Charles T. Fritsch, "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community",  
p. 177

203. Theodor H. Gaster, in The Dead Sea Scriptures, p. 3, feels  
this is the case. With the approach of the Roman Tenth Legion, they  
must have hidden them in the caves. Matthew Black, in "The Patristic  
Account of Jewish Sectarianism", p. 285, also feels this is the case.

Among those who feel that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written at a

later period is Solomon Zeitlin, as he states in "Recent Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls; The Sicarri and the Zealots", Jewish Quarterly Review, LI, (1960-1961), pl 156.

205. Moshe Pearlman, The Zealots of Masada, (New York, 1967) p. 84.

206. Josephus, Wars, II:VIII:10.

207. Josephus, Wars, II:XX:4.

## CHAPTER XI

## The Role of the Sects in the Battle for Jerusalem

While Menahem and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots were in the Negev, capturing Masada and negotiating with the Qumran Essenes, the Shammaite and Sadducean revolutionaries were doing their part in Jerusalem. To the Sadducean contingent of the confederation went the task of endowing the revolution with appropriate ideological overtones. Under the leadership of Eleazar ben Ananias, they achieved this goal through their rejection of the sacrifice of Caesar.<sup>208</sup> In order to excite the people's revolutionary fervor, they claimed that no foreign sacrifice was acceptable in the Temple.<sup>209</sup>

Realizing the gravity of the situation in Jerusalem, the pro-Roman Hillelites and Sadducees made desperate attempt to stifle the revolution at an early stage. They were unsuccessful in counteracting the Sadducean revolutionaries' propaganda against foreign sacrifices.<sup>210</sup> When it became obvious that the situation was out of hand, they sent Simon ben Ananias, Eleazar's brother, with a delegation to Florus to request military support.<sup>211</sup> In what was probably an attempt to delay the insurrectionists until Roman troops could arrive, this pro-Roman factions, beginning on 13 Ab, 66 C.E., entered into open combat with the rebels,<sup>212</sup> and succeeded in capturing Mount Zion and the upper city.<sup>213</sup>

With the Sicarri contingent in the forefront, the confederation turned the tide of battle in their favor. On 14 Ab, 66 C.E., the pro-Roman forces were overpowered and driven out of the upper city by a



Sicarii attack.<sup>214</sup> In a move to gain the support of the debtor class, the Sicarii burned the public archives containing the records of all debts.<sup>215</sup> The rebels effectively besieged the pro-Roman faction in the palace.<sup>216</sup>

Shortly thereafter Menahem and his band of Fourth Philosophy-Zealots entered Jerusalem, reinforcing their confederation compatriots.<sup>217</sup> The victor of the battle for Masada entered Jerusalem as a king. He immediately took command of the rebel forces there. There are several reasons for this ascension to the command position. He was the most credible leader. The son of Judah of Galilee, he came from a family of famous revolutionaries. At Masada he had proven his ability as a military leader. He had a well armed, experienced force behind him. He brought the approval of the Qumran Essenes. He was the acknowledged leader of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, the original revolutionary group.

Menahem was probably a messianic figure. There is evidence that he was declared the Messiah by the Qumran sect.<sup>218</sup> His messianic pretensions would explain his regal entrance into Jerusalem. The confederation accepted his messianic image because it worked to their benefit by arousing increased support from the people.

Menahem gave orders to continue the siege of the palace. The besieged offered to surrender in return for safe passage out of Jerusalem. Menahem granted this request only to the Jews. He would not let the Roman garrison out.<sup>219</sup> The Romans moved to the towers of Hippicus, Phasaelus, and Mariamne, because these bastions were easier

to defend.<sup>220</sup> On 7 Elul, 66 C.E., the high priest Ananias was captured and executed<sup>221</sup> by Menahem's forces.<sup>222</sup> Menahem proceeded to besiege the Romans in the towers.<sup>223</sup>

At some point, soon after Menahem's entry into Jerusalem, it is probable that the confederation was made public.<sup>224</sup> They dubbed themselves with the title "Kannaim", "Zealots". This title is probably derived from the actions of the Toraitic character, Phineas, who was commended for his "zeal" in defending God's cause.<sup>225</sup> Josephus' reluctance<sup>226</sup> to call them by this title serves as an indicator that this is what they called themselves. The Shammaites most definitely referred to them as "Zealots", as is evidenced in later Shammaitic laws. Shammaitic law gave them permission to attack anyone cohabiting with a heathen woman,<sup>227</sup> of stealing the service vessels from the Temple.<sup>277</sup> Cohabitation with a heathen woman probably was a euphemism to collaboration with the Romans. When the Shammaites spoke of the thief who steals the service vessels of the Temple, they were probably also speaking of the Romans. With the situation in Jerusalem well in hand, the time was right for the announcement of the formation of the Zealot party.

When the issue in Jerusalem was all but decided, a dispute between Menahem and Eleazar erupted over the question of leadership.<sup>228</sup> While the situation was desperate, Eleazar, along with his Shammaite and Sadducee backers, had put up with Menahem's messianic pretensions. Once the situation was under control, Menahem and his band of Fourth Philosophy-Zealots only stood in the way of the Shammaites and the Sadducees. The Fourth Philosophy-Zealots wanted to stop short of nothing

less than total independence. It is to be remembered that the Shammaites and Sadducees wanted the war to only go far enough as to put them in a good bargaining position with the Hillelites and the Romans. Menahem's refusal to step down<sup>299</sup> forced the Shammaite and Sadducee Zealots to dispose of him and his party. Eleazar staged an attack on them.<sup>230</sup> He caught them at the Temple, where it was possible that Menahem was having himself crowned as the Messiah.<sup>231</sup> Many of Menahem's men were killed. Menahem himself was captured, tortured, and executed. Some of Menahem's party survived. Under the leadership of Eleazar ben Jair, a relative of Menahem, they fled to Masada, where they held out against the Romans until 73 C.E. That Menahem's party retained the support of the Qumran Essenes is evidenced by the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is most probable that the "Teacher of Righteousness" of the Habakkuk Commentary is Menahem.<sup>232</sup> The capture of Jerusalem was completed not long after the assassination of Menahem.

The Shammaite and Sadducee Zealots accepted the surrender of Metilius, the Roman general.<sup>233</sup> According to the terms of surrender, the Romans had to lay down their arms. Once the surrender was complete, the Zealots, led by Eleazar, massacred the unarmed Romans. This massacre took place on the Sabbath. There can be little doubt that this massacre was part of the overall Shammaite and Sadducee strategy. Such an all subsequent fighting on the Sabbath found support in Shammaite law, which contained a dictum permitting the fighting of heathens on the Sabbath.<sup>234</sup> With the capture of Jerusalem, the first stage of the revolution was complete.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER XI

208. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:2.

209. Gittin, 55b-55a has an alternate version of the rejection of the sacrifice of Caesar. This version claims that it was all due to a misunderstanding and a treachery. It must be remembered that this version was written later, by pro-Roman Hillelites. They were probably trying to explain this incident as not being a true act of rebellion.

210. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:3-4.

211. Ibid.

212. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:5.

213. Ibid.

214. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:6.

215. Ibid.

216. Ibid.

217. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:8.

218. For further details, see below, p. 75.

219. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.

220. Ibid.

221. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:9.

222. Solomon Zeitlin, in "The Sicarii and Masada", p. 259, states the view that Ananias was killed by the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots because of their doctrine against any man being their lord. The problem with Zeitlin's explanation is that Ananias, being high priest, was not necessarily considered as a lord. The Fourth Philosophy-

Zealots directed this attack against the Roman regime. There is no reference to them ever having considered the position of high priest in the same category.

Cecil Roth, in "The Religious Nature of the Zealots", pp. 206-207, states the view that Ananias was killed by the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots because they did not accept his legitimacy as high priest. They could only have accepted a high priestly government such as existed in the pre-Hasmonean times, or a messianic administration. This is probably closer to the truth than Zeitlin's explanation.

223. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.

224. Solomon Zeitlin, in "Recent Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls; The Sicarii and the Zealots", p. 165, states the view that the Zealots came into being after the provisional government was established in Jerusalem. I feel this dating is too late. With such a conglomeration of sects present in Jerusalem, working together, before the establishment of the provisional government, they needed to announce the confederation so as not to defeat the people's suspicions. Seeing them work together, the people would view their silence as secrecy.

Cecil Roth, in "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", p. 334, states the views which is probably correct, that the Zealots came into being after the outbreak of the revolt.

225. Numbers, XXV:10; Sanhedrin, 82a; Leviticus Rabba, XXXIII:4; Numbers Rabba, XX:25.

226. Abodah Zarah, 36b; Sanhedrin, 81b.

227. Sanhedrin, Ibid.

228. Josephus, Wars, Ibid.

229. Ibid.

230. Ibid.

231. Cecil Roth, The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls, (Oxford, 1958) p. 61.

232. Cecil Roth, in "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", p. 207, states that the "Teacher of Righteousness" was a Zealot leader.

Theodor H. Gaster, in The Dead Sea Scriptures, p. 28, states that theories concerning historical allusions in the Scrolls are forced and basically incorrect.

233. Josephus, Wars, II:XVII:10.

## CHAPTER XII

## The Extension of the War Throughout Judea

## And the Defeat of Cestius Gallus' Army

## As the Ultimate Military Objective

## Of the Shammaite-Sadducee Strategy

The capture of Jerusalem was immediately followed by a number of simultaneous Zealot uprisings throughout Judea and Syria.<sup>234</sup> These brought about the capture of the citadel of Cypros, above Jericho,<sup>235</sup> the surrender of the Roman garrison at Macherus,<sup>236</sup> and an included unsuccessful revolt in Alexandria.<sup>237</sup> The uprisings were probably not coincidental, but rather a part of the Shammaite-Sadducee strategy. The uprisings appear to have been timed by the capture of Jerusalem. They were probably arranged by Menahem before the outset of the war. Through this strategy of multiple uprisings, the Zealot confederation had probably hoped to render the Roman forces in the area ineffective. In order to put down such a revolt, the Romans would have had to split their forces. On the other hand, since the Zealots, were prepared for the eventual Roman attack, they were able to obtain strategic advantages and inflict heavy casualties even if they could not defeat the Romans.

The success of this strategy is evidenced by the defeat of Cestius Gallu. When Gallus arrived at Zebulon, he found it deserted.<sup>238</sup> He left a garrison there and left with his main force. The Zealots then attacked and defeated the garrison. Gallus was also forced to leave a garrison at Sepphoris.<sup>239</sup> Gallus had to expend time, energy, provisions.



weapons, and men to drive the Zealots out of the mountains of Galilee.<sup>240</sup>

When Gallus finally arrived at Jerusalem, he was attacked and defeated by the Zealots.<sup>241</sup> This battle took place on the Sabbath. He was caught by surprise, not expecting the Zealots to attack, especially on the Sabbath. He was forced to retire and delay his major attack in the city,<sup>242</sup> His troops were tired from the long campaign in Galilee. His stores were so low that he had to provision his troops from the produce of the surrounding area. When he finally did attack the city, he met with failure for five consecutive days.<sup>243</sup>

Ultimately, Gallus was forced to lift the siege and retreat from Jerusalem.<sup>244</sup> He did not have enough provisions or weapons to sustain a long campaign. The only way he could have captured Jerusalem was by drawing upon his forces in the field. If he had taken men from the garrisons he had set up in the Galilee, there was a strong possibility that those garrisons might fall. The weakening of the garrisons would give the Zealots outside of Jerusalem enough freedom to attack him from the rear. Realizing his predicament, he had no choice but to withdraw. Once he withdrew, the Zealots counter-attacked and drove him out of Judea.<sup>245</sup>

The defeat of Cestius Gallus was a major victory for the Zealots. This was exactly what the Shammaites and the Sadducees wanted. They realized that in order for Rome to regain control of the situation, more Roman troops would have to be brought in from outside the area. This would put added pressure upon the Romans. The Shammaite and the Sadducee Zealots felt that such pressure was exactly what they needed

to bring the Romans to the negotiating table. They expected that the Romans would prefer to talk peace rather than spend all that was necessary for a major military operation. They probably hoped that such a demonstration of their ability to defeat the local Roman legions would convince the Romans that they, not the Hillelites and the establishment Sadducees, had the real power over the Judean society, and that the reins of local government should be delivered into their hands. Therefore, with the decisive defeat of the forces of Cestius Gallus, the military aspect of the Shammaite-Sadducee plan for the revolution was at an end. They only waited for the invitation to the negotiating table.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER XII

234. Josephus, Wars, IIXVIII:1.  
235. Josephus, Wars, II:XVIII:6.  
236. Ibid.  
237. Josephus, Wars, II:XVIII:7-8.  
238. Josephus, Wars, II:XVIII:9.  
239. Josephus, Wars, II:XVIII:11.  
240. Ibid.  
241. Josephus, Wars, II:XIX:2.  
242. Josephus, Wars, II:XIX:4.  
243. Josephus, Wars, II:XIX:5.  
244. Josephus, Wars, II:XIX:7.  
245. Josephus, Wars, II:XIX:7-9.

## CHAPTER AIII

The Shammaite and the Sadducean Preparations  
For the Final Stage of their Limited Revolution

With the Gestius Gallus defeated, the Zealots returned to Jerusalem. When they returned they dealt with their remaining pro-Roman opposition in the city.<sup>246</sup> The Shammaites and the Sadducees were among these opponents. They purposely created the pro-Roman contingent in expectation of their eventual surrender. When the time for surrender came, the Shammaites and the Sadducees knew they could count on these people to support them. They also had a number of pro-Romans executed in order to keep up their anti-Roman facade.

Once matters were settled in Jerusalem, and a provisional government, under the Shammaites and the Sadducees, was set up, the country was divided into territories, and governors were appointed over them.<sup>247</sup> Joseph ben Gorion and Ananus were appointed over Jerusalem, Eleazar ben Ananias over Idumea, and Flavius Josephus over Galilee. All were Shammaite-Sadducee functionaries and aware of the plan for a limited revolution. They were ready to surrender their territories to Rome at the appropriate time.

What occurred in the Galilee, during the period between the two Roman invasions, was one of the major factors which contributed to the downfall of the Shammaite-Sadducee plan for a limited revolution. John of Gischala, one of the major Fourth Philosophy-Zealots in Galilee, unwittingly discovered the intentions of the Shammaites and the Sadducees. He attributed the betrayal of the Galilee to Josephus.<sup>248</sup> Believing

that the Shammaite-Sadducean government in Jerusalem had every intention of carry out the war to its end, John persistently notified them of Josephus- treachery.<sup>249</sup> Under this pressure, the government had no recourse but to take action against Josephus.<sup>250</sup> They first recalled him. When he did not respond, they sent an army out against him. To keep itself above suspicion until the time was right, they had to disassociate themselves from Josephus. The discovery of Josephus' part in the plot to surrender Judea to Rome cost the Shammaites and the Sadducees their foothold in Galilee. This loss was a serious setback in their overall strategy.

The Shammaites and the Sadducees utilized the period between invasions to try to rid the Zealot confederation of all elements which could threaten their plans to end the war.<sup>251</sup> They sent out an army against the Fourth Philosophy-Zealot, Simon bar Giora.<sup>252</sup> Simon was forced to flee to Masada, where he remained until Ananus and his party were out of power in Jerusalem. Their action against Simon was just one such action to rid the revolution of all extremists.<sup>253</sup> They believed that once they accomplished this, nothing could stand in they way of their eventual surrender to the Romans.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER XIII

246. Josephus, Wars, II:XX:3-4.

247. Ibid.

248. Josephus, Wars, II:XXI:2.

249. Josephus, Wars, II:XXI:7.

250. Ibid.

251. Solomon Zeitlin, in "The Sicarii and Masada", p. 253, states that the members of the provisional government were completely opposed to war and tried to disarm the extremists. This was Josephus' job in the Galilee.

252. Josephus, Wars, II:XXII:2.

253. Josephus, Wars, II:XXII:1.

## CHAPTER XIV

The Failure of the Shammaite-Sadducean Plan  
For a Limited Revolution

Several factors contributed to the failure of the Shammaite-Sadducean plan for a limited revolution. One was its underestimation of the Roman reaction to the revolution. The Shammaites and Sadducees believed that the Romans would be willing to negotiate a peace once the Zealots had gained a significant victory. They expected the Romans to see a truce as politically advantageous. They did not take into account that Rome could not afford to set a precedent with them. If the Romans let the Zealots get away with rebelling against their Roman overlords, other nations under Roman rule would take this as a sign of weakness. Rome would be troubled with rebellions throughout the empire. Therefore, the Romans had to set an example for the rest of the empire by crushing this revolution in the most brutal and complete way possible.

Rome decided to destroy the Zealots at all costs. Nero, the Roman emperor, chose Vespasian, his finest general, to put down the Judean revolt.<sup>254</sup> Vespasian was supplied with all the troops needed to do the job.<sup>255</sup> Unlike Cestius Gallus, Vespasian did not underestimate the military ability of the Zealots. He took great care in preparing for his invasion. At Ptolemais, he waited for his son, Titus, to arrive with his main force.<sup>256</sup> He put his army in order before starting the campaign.<sup>257</sup> Before engaging in military action, he attempted to demoralize his Zealot opposition.<sup>258</sup>



Before each battle, he sent out "Feeler" expeditions in order to ascertain the strength of his opposition.<sup>259</sup> He took each city separately, refusing to split his forces unnecessarily. More concerned with success than with speed, he utilized siege tactics to their fullest.<sup>260</sup> In order to be at peak efficiency, he gave his troops a rest before taking on the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>261</sup>

Another factor contributing to the failure of the Shammaite-Sadducean plan was their loss of control over Galilee. In order to retain some authority after being abandoned by his Shammaite and Sadducean backers, Josephus had to continue the war in Galilee, discarding his previous plans of surrender.<sup>262</sup> Once the Shammaites and the Sadducees lost control of Galilee, extremist Zealots, probably some Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, took over and planned a fight to the end.<sup>263</sup> The Shammaites and the Sadducees retained strong support only in a few cities. In Tarichaea, this support manifested itself when the Shammaite-Sadducee Zealots entered into open conflict with the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots over the issue of surrendering the city.<sup>264</sup> In Gischala, they ousted John of Gischala and the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, and surrendered to Titus.<sup>265</sup>

Another factor contributing to the failure of the Shammaite-Sadducean plan was their loss of control over Jerusalem. After Vespasian's defeats of the Zealots in Galilee, Jerusalem was inundated with refugees from the north.<sup>266</sup> These people were, for the most part, Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.<sup>267</sup> They came to Jerusalem because they knew that there in Jerusalem the Zealots would have to make a stand. Among these refugees were John of Gischala and his men.<sup>268</sup> These

Fourth Philosophy-Zealots took control of the city. They gathered provisions from the surrounding area as preparation for the eventual Roman siege.<sup>269</sup> They appointed their own high priest, removing Ananus, the leader of the Shammaite-Sadducean contingent.<sup>270</sup> They prepared the Temple as a fortress.<sup>271</sup> This had a two-fold purpose. It was prepared for a last stand against the Romans. However, it was also prepared in case of a Shammaite-Sadducean uprising in the city.

In hopes of salvaging their plan, the Shammaite-Sadducee Zealots attempted to regain control of the city. They incited an open revolt against the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.<sup>272</sup> This revolt was led by Ananus, the former Zealot commander of Jerusalem.<sup>273</sup> The Shammaite-Sadducee party was too strong for the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots.<sup>274</sup> They drove the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots into the Temple, kept them besieged there, and the Shammaites sent to Vespasian for help.<sup>275</sup> This was obviously an attempt to regain favor in the eyes of the Romans. Vespasian's failure to accede to their request seems to indicate that he wanted to make the most of this factionalism by letting the Jews destroy themselves.

In order to turn the tide, the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots sent to their Idumean allies for help.<sup>276</sup> The Idumeans arrived quickly.<sup>277</sup> The Shammaite-Sadducean party failed in their attempt to negotiate with them,<sup>278</sup> and the Idumeans laid siege to the city.<sup>279</sup> With help from the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots inside, they entered the city and defeated the Shammaite-Sadducean party.<sup>280</sup> Then they left Jerusalem,<sup>281</sup> probably realizing that the situation there was hopeless and that the Romans would eventually win. They also had to protect their own territory

against the Romans. Once the Idumeans left the city, the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots executed many leaders of the Shammaite-Sadducean party.<sup>282</sup> With the defeat of the Shammaite-Sadducee party in Jerusalem, the last possibility of their plan for a limited revolution was destroyed. The last major Zealot stronghold under the control of the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots, Jerusalem, was committed to the revolution until the end.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER XIV

254. Josephus, Wars, III:I:2.
255. Josephus, Wars, III:I:3.
256. Josephus, Wars, III:IV:2.
257. Josephus, Wars, III:IV:1.
258. Josephus, Wars, III:IV:3.
259. Josephus, Wars, III:VI:1; III:VII:31; III:IX:2; IV:I:8.
260. Josephus, Wars, III:VII:4; III:X:1; IV:I:3.
261. Josephus, Wars, IV:II:1.
262. Josephus, Wars, III:IV:1; III:VII:3.
263. Josephus, Wars, III:VII:31; IV:I:2-4, 8, 9.
264. Josephus, Wars, III:XI:4.
265. Josephus, Wars, IV:II:1-5.
266. Cecil Roth, "The Zealots in the War of 66-73", p. 343.
267. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:4.
268. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:1-2.
269. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:2-3.
270. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:6-8.
271. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:6-7.
272. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:9.
273. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:11.
274. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:12.
275. Josephus, Wars, IV:III:14.
276. Josephus, Wars, IV:IV:1.
277. Josephus, Wars, IV:IV:3.

- 278. Josephus, Wars, IV:IV:3-4.
- 279. Josephus, Wars, IV:IV:5.
- 280. Josephus, Wars, IV:IV:7-V:1.
- 281. Josephus, Wars, IV:IV:1.
- 282. Ibid.

## CHAPTER XV

Factionalism Among the Zealots as a Major Contributing Factor  
To their Defeat

The internal strife in Jerusalem did not end with the defeat of the Shammaite-Sadducee party by the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots. Not long after the Fourth Philosophy-Zealots had gained control of the city, they split into two warring factions,<sup>283</sup> one under the leadership of John of Gischala, the other faction under Eleazar ben Simon. In the initial fighting, John gained control of the city. This split was probably not just a disagreement over leadership, but the result was a basic conflict over policy.<sup>284</sup>

Jerusalem's internal problems were complicated by the arrival of Simon bar Giora.<sup>285</sup> After learning of the defeat of the Shammaite-Sadducee party, Simon returned to the city to form a third faction in the conflict. Simon constituted a significant threat to both John and Eleazar, both of whom he opposed.<sup>286</sup> From his sojourn at Masada, it can be assumed that his ideology was close to Menahem's. In his attempt to gain control of Jerusalem, he utilized the conflict between John and Eleazar. He did not immediately enter Jerusalem, but besieged the city.<sup>287</sup> His presence outside the city gave the remnants of the Shammaite-Sadducee party hope. They invited Simon into the city in an attempt to oust John.<sup>288</sup> It is probable that the Shammaites and the Sadducees hoped in this way to increase the chaos within the Zealot ranks. The increased internal conflict would make it easier for the Shammaites and the Sadducees to

overthrow the Zealots later. Once the Zealots were overthrown, they could turn the city over to the Romans. For the Shammites and the Sadducees, this was an investment for the future.

Simon accepted the invitation into the city, even though he probably realized the intentions of the Shammites and the Sadducees. Simon probably felt that their minimal support gave him an opportunity to take over the city. Once he was in the city, Simon worked together with Eleazar against their common enemy, John.<sup>289</sup> With Eleazar's forces situated above John's, and Simon's forces situated below them, they hit John from both sides. In an attempt to free himself from this desperate situation, John set fire to the food storehouses in the city, hoping to starve his opponents into submission. The devastating effects of John's action were not to be felt until later during the Roman siege of Jerusalem.

The arrival of Titus forced John, Eleazar, and Simon to call a temporary truce.<sup>290</sup> Like Vespasian, Titus saw the wisdom in allowing the dissention within the Zealots do his job for him. He therefore delayed his attack on the city. As Titus had suspected, the truce did not last long. John's forces attacked and defeated Eleazar's faction.<sup>291</sup> Eleazar, and the survivors of his faction, were incorporated into John's forces. Despite the presence of the Romans outside the city, John and Simon persisted in their struggle. John's forces comprising of 6,000 of his own men and 2,400 of Eleazar's, controlled the Temple area. Simon's forces, 10,000 of his own men and 5,000 Idumeans, controlled the upper city.<sup>292</sup> Whatever the differences



between these two groups, they were obviously sufficiently important and great enough for the internal conflict in Jerusalem to take precedence over the war with Rome. This could not have been, as Josephus perceived it, a mere struggle for leadership between strong personalities.

With the Romans at the gates of Jerusalem, John and Simon called a second truce.<sup>293</sup> But it was too late. The harm had already been done. The factional rivalries had severely weakened the Zealots. John's burning of the storehouses had made it impossible for them to withstand a long siege. The famine in Jerusalem<sup>294</sup> led to mass desertions to the Romans.<sup>295</sup> Roman attacks destroyed the Temple.<sup>296</sup> In spite of their desperate situation, the Zealot leaders encouraged their forces to continue the fight until the bitter end,<sup>297</sup> assuring them that God would miraculously deliver them. These Fourth Philosophy-Zealot leaders had no alternative but to fight. Their ideology they had expounded for so long accepted nothing less than total independence from Rome. Ever since the time of Judah of Galilee, they preached that death was preferable to submission to the Romans. These leaders knew that if they were desert this ideology, their men, who were ready to die for these beliefs, would kill them. If they fought to the end, there was at least a chance that the Romans would capture them and spare their lives, even if it meant slavery. The Zealots were inevitably defeated. After unsuccessfully trying to avoid capture, John and Simon surrendered.<sup>298</sup> It was not long before the capture of Jerusalem was complete.<sup>299</sup> The capture and destruction of Jerusalem marked the end of the Second Jewish Commonwealth.

## Footnotes to CHAPTER XV

283. Josephus, Wars, IV:VIII:1.  
284. Cecil Roth, "The Zealots in the War of 66-73" pp. 341-342.  
285. Josephus, Wars, IV:IX:3.  
286. Josephus, Wars, IV:IX:5.  
287. Josephus, Wars, IV:IX:12.  
288. Ibid.  
289. Josephus, Wars, V:I:2.  
290. Josephus, Wars, V:II:4.  
291. Josephus, Wars, V:III:1.  
292. Ibid.  
293. Josephus, Wars, V:VI:4.  
294. Josephus, Wars, V:X:2.  
295. Josephus, Wars, V:X:1.  
296. Josephus, Wars, VI:IV:5.  
297. Josephus, Wars, VI:V:2.  
298. Josephus, Wars, VI:IX:4.  
299. Josephus, Wars, VI:X:1.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberbach, M. "The Historical Allusions of Chapters IV, XI, and XIII of the Psalms of Solomon." Jewish Quarterly Review, LII (April, 1951), 379-396.
- Allon, Gedaliah. Toldot Hayehudim Be-eretz Yisrael Betekufat Hamishmah Vehatalmud. Israel: Hakibutz Hameuchad Ltd., 1952
- Babylonian Talmud. Soncino edition, (1965)
- Barnes, Timothy D. "The Date of Herod's Death." Journal of Theological Studies, XIX (April, 1968), 204-209.
- Black, Matthew. "The Patristic Account of Jewish Sectarianism." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. XLI (March, 1959), 285-303.
- Brandon, S. G. F. Jesus and the Zealots. Manchester University Press, 1967, Great Britain.
- Brandon, S. G. F. "Jesus and the Zealots." Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society, II (1959-1961), 11-24.
- Brandon, S. G. F. "Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, LIV (Autumn, 1971), 47-66.
- Dead Sea Scrolls. Translated by Theodor H. Gaster. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1964
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Herod's Oath and the Baptist's Head." Biblische Zeitschrift, IX (January and July, 1965), 49-59, 233-246/

- Filmer, W. E. "The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great."  
Journal of Theological Studies, XVII (October, 1966), 283-298.
- Fritsch, Charles T. "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community."  
Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIV (1955), 173-181.
- Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1964.
- Holy Scriptures, Jewish Publication Society of America edition, 1917.
- Josephus, Flavius. The Antiquities of the Jews. Whinston edition.  
 Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1960.
- Josephus, Flavius. Life of Flavius Josephus. Whinston edition.  
 Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1960.
- Josephus, Flavius, The Wars of the Jews. Whinston edition.  
 Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1960.
- Marcus, Ralph. "Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics."  
Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1954), 157-161.
- Marcus, Ralph. "'Tree of Life' in Essene (?) Tradition."  
Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (1955), 274.
- Midrash Rabba. Soncino edition, 1939.
- New Testament. Revised Standard Version, 1946.

Pearlman, Moshe. The Zealots of Masada. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

Rabinowitz, L. "The First Essenes." Journal of Semetic Studies, IV (October, 1959), 358-361.

Roth, Cecil, The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Roth, Cecil, "The Religious Nature of the Zealots." Leo Jung Jubilee Volume, (1962) 203-209.

Roth, Cecil. "The Zealots in the War of 66-73." Journal of Semetic Studies, IV (October, 1959), 332-355.

Smith, J.P. "The Essenes in Philo on the Essenes?" Biblica, XL (1959), 1021-1024.

Smith, Morton. "The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena." Hebrew Union College Annual, XXIX (1958), 273-313.

Stern, Menahem. "A. Schalit's Herod." Journal of Jewish Studies, XI (1960), 49-58.

Stern, Menahem. "The Politics of Herod and the Jewish Society Towards the End of the Second Commonwealth." Tarbiz, XXXV (March, 1966), 235-253.

Van Der Ploeg, J. "The Meals of the Essenes." Journal of Semetic Studies, II (April, 1957), 163-175.

- Zeitlin, Solomon. "The Essenes and Messianic Expectation." Jewish Quarterly Review, XLV (October, 1954), 83-119.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. "The Account of Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena." Jewish Quarterly Review LIX (April, 1959), 292-300.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. "Herod: A Malevolent Maniac." Jewish Quarterly Review, LIV (July, 1963), 1-27.
- Zeitlin, Solomon, "Recent Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Sicarii and the Zealots." Jewish Quarterly Review, LI (October, 1960 and January, 1961), 156-169, 254-261.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. The Rise and Fall of the Judean State. II. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. "The Sicarii and Masada." Jewish Quarterly Review LVII (April, 1967), 251-270.